

JPRS-UIA-86-042

22 SEPTEMBER 1986

# USSR Report

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

22 SEPTEMBER 1986

## USSR REPORT INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

### CONTENTS

#### WORLDWIDE TOPICS

Relations Between Working Classes, Mankind's Interests Viewed (M. Mchedlov; PRAVDA, 8 Aug 86) .....	1
Antarctic Expedition Head Discusses Planned Activities (Moscow Domestic Service, 24 Aug 86) .....	7
UN Urged To Create 'All-Encompassing' Security System (Moscow International Service, 15 Aug 86) .....	8

#### WESTERN EUROPE

U.S. Envoy's Remarks on Austrian Neutrality Hit (O. Nikiforov; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 22 Aug 86) .....	10
--	----

#### LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

Table of Contents: LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 4, 1986 (LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, 1986) .....	12
Volskiy Analyzes, Characterizes Latin American Capitalism (V. V. Volskiy; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 86) .....	14
Strategy of Democratic Forces in LA Anti-Imperialist Struggle (B. M. Merin, Yu. I. Vizgunova; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 86) .....	28
Increasing Latin American Activity in World Affairs Noted (A. N. Glinkin; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 86) .....	38

Course of Soviet-Latin American Political Relations Examined (A. I. Sizonenko; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 86) .....	46
ILA Scientific Council Views Past Achievements, Future Tasks (P. P. Yakovlev; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 86) .....	53
International Cooperation, Activities of ILA Described (K. A. Torkova; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 86) .....	56
Soviet-Argentine Meeting Views Latin American Debt Crisis (I. Ye. Shokina; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 86) .....	60
Latin America Institute Works Published 1981-1985 (K. A. Surova; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 86) .....	62
Book on Caribbean Politics, Economy Reviewed (A. D. Dridzo; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, Apr 86) .....	68

/9987



## WORLDWIDE TOPICS

### RELATIONS BETWEEN WORKING CLASSES, MANKIND'S INTERESTS VIEWED

PM121122 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 86 First Edition pp 2-3

[Article by M. Mchedlov under the rubric "Questions of Theory": "The Historic Mission of the Working Class: New Aspects"; capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] Nowadays Marxist-Leninist ideas about the historic mission of the working class and socialism are acquiring new meaning and being enriched with new substance. Let us recall one of the fundamental ideas of Marxism, to which F. Engels repeatedly drew attention. In the foreword to the 1883 German edition of the "Communist Party Manifesto," and also in the foreword to the 1888 English Edition, he emphasized that at a given stage in the development of the class struggle the proletariat cannot free itself from the yoke of the exploiting and ruling bourgeois class without at the same time freeing once and for all the whole of society from exploitation, oppression, and the class struggle.

This captures the most important feature of the historic mission of the working class and the fundamental difference between its political victory--the assertion of socialism--and the previous sociopolitical revolutions. For the first time in history the working class acts not as a class seeking to assert its power with a view to securing privileges at the expense of other social groups. On the contrary, it expresses and defends the interests of all working people and the broad masses of the population, relying here on the objective laws of the development of physical production and on the really existing social and economic factors.

The profound humanist essence of the worldwide historic mission of the working class consists in freeing all working people from class oppression and lack of social rights and asserting sociopolitical equality, social justice, and the free and comprehensive development of all peoples and of every individual. This function of the theory and practice of scientific communism--a function traditionally developed fundamentally by Marxism-Leninism--is nowadays being supplemented by another two functions: 1) the rescue of our planet's entire population and of the human race as a biological species and 2) the rescue of nature (or, at least, these functions are making themselves particularly urgent). Since they concern a cardinal alternative--life or death for all people on earth--and can be resolved through the joint efforts of peoples and countries, this imposes a number of new features on modern political thinking, on methods of acting in the international arena, on the establishment of

Priorities among the tasks facing us, on the correlation of the general democratic struggle and the class struggle, and so forth.

These problems, along with others, were elaborated in depth by the 27th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the socialist community countries' fraternal parties.

Marxism has never been a closed, sectarian teaching oriented just toward a narrow circle of adherents or a single social stratum. Although the ideology of the working class, it has certainly not been confined to the interests just of its own fundamental social base. The problem of the relationship and unity of general human interests and the interests of the working class and of the link between the historic mission of the working class and mankind's future has been examined repeatedly in works by the classics of Marxism-Leninism. F. Engels, for example, emphasized in his address "To the Working Class of Great Britain," written back in 1845: "I am convinced that you are more than just ENGLISH people, members of a single isolated nation; you are PEOPLE, members of a single great common family, conscious that your interests coincide with those of all mankind.... Your success is ensured, and no step that you have taken forward in this movement will be lost to our common cause--the cause of all mankind!" (K. Marx and F. Engels: Works, Vol 2, pp 236-237).

Of course, the connection between and unity of the interests of the working class and of all mankind must not be seen as their full identity. The priorities can be different at different times, depending on the specific conditions and the nature of the social tasks being resolved. When V.I. Lenin said in his work "Our Party's Draft Program" that "from the viewpoint of Marxism's basic ideas the interests of social development are above the interests of the proletariat" (Complete Collected Works, Vol 4, p 220), he thereby emphasized a historically transient feature both in the proletariat's actual position and in the interests resulting from that position. Only in the long term, in a classless society, is the full coincidence of the interests of all sections of society possible, in just the same way as, on an international plane, the full coincidence of general democratic and class interests obviously presupposes the existence of states with a single sociopolitical system on the planet, or at least on its main land masses.

At the present stage of historical development general human interests coincide IN PRINCIPLE with the interests of the working class and of the theory and practice of socialism, for their values correspond more than ever before to the essence and needs of mankind's development, while Marxism-Leninism, advocating the assertion on earth of a meaningful, free, peaceful, and happy life for all peoples, thereby expresses general human interests with the utmost profundity.

Today the world is faced with an unprecedented situation. The 27th CPSU Congress comprehensively analyzed a grim reality of our days: Nuclear weapons harbor a tornado that could wipe the human race off the face of the earth.

This was precisely why the Central Committee Political Report to the congress emphasized that "socialism unconditionally rejects wars as a means of resolving interstate political and economic contradictions and ideological disputes. Our ideal is a world without weapons and violence, a world in which every people freely chooses its path of development and way of life. This is an expression of the humanism of communist ideology, of its moral values. Therefore, THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE NUCLEAR DANGER AND THE ARMS RACE AND FOR THE PRESERVATION AND STRENGTHENING OF WORLD PEACE remains for the future, too, the main direction of the party's activity in the world arena." This position is shared and is actively being implemented by all the socialist community countries.

There is no alternative to this policy, just as there have been no historical analogues of the situation that has taken shape in the world today. It is sufficient to point out that the nature of present-day weapons leaves no state any hope of defending itself by military-technical means alone. And it is impossible to win a nuclear war. Ensuring security is now increasingly being seen as a political task, and it can be resolved only by political means. As regards security, if we take international relations as a whole, it can only be universal. In short, the modern world has become too small and fragile for military conflicts. It cannot be saved and preserved unless we break--decisively and irrevocably--with the ways of thinking and acting which have been built for centuries on the acceptability and admissibility of wars and armed conflicts. The fundamental vital interests of any people are integrated in this way of putting the problem, as profoundly substantiated by the 27th CPSU Congress. Therefore, even though the United States and its military-industrial machine remain the locomotive of militarism, the interests and aims of the military-industrial complex are in no way identical with the interests and aims of the American people.

It would be a profound mistake to regard the titanic struggle for peace being waged by the USSR and the socialist countries as [dictated by] considerations of expediency or as their weakness. It is determined by awareness of a great responsibility, by the intention to save both themselves and others from catastrophe, by understanding of the humane aim of strengthening peace and the peoples' security, and by the desire to rigorously follow the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous cooperation among states.

In order to really achieve these aims the fraternal countries are systematically implementing a package of measures which flexibly combine class, national, and general human interests and are aimed at reducing tension in international relations. They propose the development of equitable mutually advantageous relations with capitalist states and broader cooperation in the political, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural spheres.

The difficulty and dialectical contradictoriness here consist of the fact that the socialist countries, while being the initiators and consistent champions of this, the only sensible policy that meets mankind's interests, cannot solve burning questions on their own. Their practical resolution presupposes broad international cooperation and collective efforts by many states, regardless of their social system.

This is why Marxist-Leninist parties and the socialist community countries tirelessly urge all states--large and small, developed and developing--to undertake a dialogue, joint actions, and cooperation to solve problems of vital importance to all mankind. And sectarianism and exclusiveness are contraindicated here. Unity of action and cooperation among all detachments of the working class are assuming special importance. It was emphasized at the 27th party congress that "the CPSU's solidarity with the forces of national and social liberation and our policy of close cooperation with countries of a socialist orientation, with revolutionary democratic parties, and with the nonaligned movement remain immutable. The Soviet public is ready to continue developing ties with noncommunist trends and organizations, including religious ones, which are opposed to war."

The question might arise: If it is mankind's supreme task today to avoid military catastrophe, how does this affect the social aims of the working class and the class confrontation between labor and capital, between socialism and capitalism?

The world, the Central Committee Political Report to the congress emphasized, is going through a process of rapid change, and no one is capable of preserving an eternal status quo in it. The mole of history is doing its part, and so Marxist-Leninists are confident that social and ideological contradictions will be resolved by the peoples themselves in their own countries. They have many grounds for this, both traditional and stemming from the contradictions at the contemporary stage of development of bourgeois society. Therefore, the problem is a different one: Without closing our eyes to social, political, and ideological contradictions, to master the science and art of behaving with restraint and circumspection in the international arena and to live under conditions of correct international relations and cooperation.

Marxist-Leninists have always been opposed to the forcible "making happy" of the peoples, as Engels would say, and to a military solution to the chief contradiction of the age. Whereas this has always been correct, the truth of this thesis is now increasing many times over.

In the contemporary situation objective conditions have taken shape whereby the confrontation between capitalism and socialism can only and exclusively take the forms of peaceful competition and peaceful rivalry. Mankind can survive together or perish together. And the more acute the impending threat of nuclear annihilation, the more strongly people are aware nowadays of belonging to a single human race and of the need for resolute struggle for survival and the salvation of civilization.

The theoretical and practical resolution of this priority general human requirement is inconceivable without the decisive contribution of Marxist-Leninist theory and the world socialist system. This presupposes both a flexible political line and in-depth theoretical elaboration making it possible to continue reliably asserting the humanist purport of Marxism-Leninism.



Exceptional urgency also attaches nowadays to questions of a conscious attitude to the environment and the utilization of natural resources, so as to prevent their exhaustion and not undermine the natural conditions of man's existence and living nature by upsetting the sensible organization of the exchange of substances between society and nature. The approach of Marxist-Leninist science to analyzing the relationship between nature and society and the practice of resolving it under the conditions of real socialism rely on a realistic comprehensive study of the situation that has taken shape, taking into account the interests of the present and future generations of people.

Marx once remarked prophetically that a culture leaves behind itself a desert if it develops spontaneously and is not consciously directed. In its pursuit of superprofits monopoly capital rapaciously exploits natural resources, not only showing no concern for their careful utilization and replenishment, but also undermining the conditions which to one degree or another constitute the property of all mankind (the ocean, the atmosphere) or of individual states. Broad world public circles are drawing attention to the huge irreplaceable losses in the planet's flora and fauna, and various organizations and general democratic movements are involved in protecting them.

Mankind is now confronted with the fact that the progressive and inevitable processes of industrialization, urbanization, and the scientific and technical revolution are giving rise to serious ecological disharmonies in all parts of the planet. Today all states, regardless of their social nature, are in one way or another tackling ecological problems in an attempt to preserve or improve man's environment. Of course, much is also being done in the capitalist world. However, these problems cannot be solved consistently in a society where competition, the pursuit of profit, and the cult of consumption rule.

Free from such conflicts and guided by a different scale of values--by the good, the health, and the happiness of present and future generations--socialist society is capable of regulating the utilization of natural resources on a statewide scale by relying on long-term planning and of establishing regulations for protecting the environment. The task of protecting nature and making rational use of its resources was acutely set at the 27th CPSU Congress. The congress proceeded from the premise that socialism with its planned organization of production and humanist world outlook is capable of introducing harmony into the relationship between society and nature.

It is known that all the socialist community countries, particularly within the CEMA framework, are implementing a system of measures, including measures of an economic, technical, legal, and educational nature--which enables socialism, as stated in the new edition of the CPSU Program, to take up "vanguard positions in mankind's struggle to preserve and augment the planet's natural resources." Of course, even in a socialist society there are problems on this plane which give rise to alarm and the need to take urgent measures, to step up control over the use of nature, and to widely develop the population's ecological education.

However, it is obvious that the only protection against all the vicissitudes of the development of civilization can be a new civilization itself--socially just, technically equipped, having grown wise and accumulated the experience of losses.

Here, too, socialism's contribution--in the complex and perhaps still not fully realized system of relations between nature and society--is characterized by the fact that the technical, economic, sociopolitical, and humanist aspects and sides of the problem are linked together, and the prospects for the protection and preservation of the environment and the reproduction of natural resources are revealed--prospects which all peoples understand and which are propitious for mankind's destiny. At the same time, while striving to have a purposeful and organized impact on nature and to preserve the equilibrium of the biosphere, the society in which the working class occupies the vanguard place does not seek just to maintain the static equilibrium of natural processes and the status quo of the natural environment but strives for its systematic transformation, in which increasingly favorable conditions for man's physical and moral existence and for mankind's development would take shape. Socialism uses such a humanist yardstick to approach urgent ecological problems whose solution sometimes demands joint action by countries with different social systems.

Nowadays, when mankind's future and the natural conditions of its existence and development are in question, communists have been charged with the lofty mission of being in the front ranks of the general human movement for peace and uniting around this goal all working people and all sensibly-minded people. In the present critical and crucial situation the communist movement worthily places before the whole world a program of creation, creativity, and reason, a program for preserving and developing life and the human environment.

The developing communist civilization is an objective condition and an urgent requirement for the further progress of the human race. It increasingly expresses general human interests, being the legitimate, thrifty successor to and defender of all cultural property and the guarantor of mankind's further development.

/8309

CSO: 1807/387

## WORLDWIDE TOPICS

### ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION HEAD DISCUSSES PLANNED ACTIVITIES

LD242209 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Aug 86

[Text] Preparations have begun in Leningrad for the 32d Soviet Antarctic expedition. Valeriy Yakovlevich Vovk, the head of the expedition's winter team, is at our microphone:

[Vovk] The expedition will continue scientific studies at seven Soviet Antarctic stations. Studies in the Antarctic are of great practical importance in particular for the study of climate and for weather forecasts. An evaluation of the influence of anthropogenic factors on the Antarctic environment will be carried out with the aim of protecting it, and geological studies will be carried out in order to ascertain the Antarctic's raw material resources. These are, first of all, geological studies in the Soyuz base area; studies of the interaction of the ocean and the atmosphere, which will be carried out on scientific vessels; as well as biological and [word indistinct] studies.

This summer the selection of a suitable place for the opening of a new permanent Antarctic station is also planned. Members of the expedition and their equipment will be transported to the Antarctic with the help of IL-76 and IL-18 aircraft and eight vessels, headed by the "Mikhail Somov," the Antarctic fleet's flagship. The first flight of an IL-76 aircraft to the area is planned for the end of October. It would not be true to say that there are no problems. We very much await the replacement of IL-14's by new aircraft for intracontinental flights.

/8309

CSO: 1807/383

## WORLDWIDE TOPICS

### UN URGED TO CREATE 'ALL-ENCOMPASSING' SECURITY SYSTEM

LD151813 Moscow International Service in Czech 1500 GMT 15 Aug 86

[Station commentary]

[Text] As we have reported, a group of socialist countries has proposed that the question of the creation of an [word indistinct] system of international security be put on the agenda of the UN General Assembly. A Moscow Radio commentator writes:

What causes the need to create such a system? Humanity is going through an exceptionally responsible stage in its development. It is faced with a dilemma. Either to find itself in the pit of nuclear self-destruction or to rebuild international relations from their foundation. Today no single state, no matter how powerful it is, can count on defense by purely military means. As leading experts admit, even the strategic defense initiative program, advocated by Reagan, which sound-thinking politicians call a mistaken initiative, cannot give a guarantee of defense in the case of nuclear conflict. An unbreakable nuclear umbrella over America is a utopia. And what about small countries?

From this it follows that reliable security can only be ensured by political means in our time, only by joint effort of all states, large and small. And since the present world has become interdependent and unified in many things, even security is indivisible. It can only be universal and the same for all. It is not possible to try and take comfort from the fact that the absolute majority of the earth's inhabitants today live in peace, that military conflicts occur only in individual parts of the world. Peace must be founded not only on the fact that there are no wars but also on a reliable, all encompassing system of security.

Such a system is being proposed by socialist states. It concerns not only military and political but also (?ecumenical) and humanitarian areas. The new initiative of the fraternal countries is the result of their collective wisdom, an expression of (?coordinated) action on the international arena. The idea of the creation of an all-encompassing system of international security, as we know, was set out at the 27th CPSU Congress. It was approved by fraternal



countries and the peace-loving public of the world. The effort to create such a system was discussed at the June session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact states.

The new proposal from socialist countries, in a way continues and links together all the peace initiatives which have recently been put forward by them. For example let us recall the appeal by Warsaw Pact states to the countries of the West on the question of the creation of nuclear free zones in Europe, or the initiative of the socialist community to limit the activities of military and navy and to reduce the number of weapons. Included in this also is the extensive program of reduction of forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Proposals by the socialist countries of Asia concerning the normalization of the situation in the Asia and Pacific area are also part of the [word indistinct] system of security. The proposal of Czechoslovakia and the GDR about the removal of chemical weapons from Europe is relevant. The new concrete step made by socialist states opens perspectives for the complete removal of war from the life of humanity. We believe in this perspective and jointly strive to put it into practice.

/8309

CSO: 1807/387

## WESTERN EUROPE

### U.S. ENVOY'S REMARKS ON AUSTRIAN NEUTRALITY HIT

PM221501 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Aug 86 p 3

[Own correspondent O. Nikiforov "Rejoinder": "The Ambassador Is Angry..."]

[Text] Ronald Lauder, the new U.S. ambassador to Vienna, loves to order people about, but he does not like to be contradicted. It is possible that the scion of the Lauder perfume "empire" acquired these qualities during his service in the Pentagon. However that may be, having moved from the banks of the Potomac to the banks of the Danube, he immediately started to lecture the Austrians on how they should live in the future. Frankly speaking, there is much that R. Lauder does not like. For instance, Austria's neutrality. In a recent interview to the Vienna journal PROFIL, he stated this with the bluntness of a military man. With every passing day, the ambassador said, it is becoming more and more difficult to remain absolutely neutral, and the time will come when the question of neutrality will have to be revised. He went as far as to advise the Austrians to annul the state treaty to all intents and purposes and to equip the Austrian army with missile weapons.

One would like to ask his excellency, the ambassador: Does anyone threaten Austria? Is his excellency, the ambassador, familiar with the recent proposals of the USSR for the reduction of all--without exception--armed forces in Europe?

But it is dangerous to disagree with the ambassador. The PROFIL journalist tried, as it were, to explain the reasons for the Austrians' critical attitude to U.S. support for the Nicaraguan "contras" and the ambassador flew into a rage. When he succeeded in "convincing" the correspondent that the Austrians, as distinct from the White House, are "poorly" informed about the situation in Central America, the ambassador decided that it would be "absurd" to continue the conversation.

Mr. Lauder wanted to change the subject. From neutrality he passed on to Soviet-Austrian relations and tried to prompt the Austrians to take steps which would be clearly unpopular in the Alpine republic. How else is one to understand the clearly feigned "surprise" at the fact that, as the ambassador said,

the Austrian Government is taking no steps to extract from the USSR compensation for the damage allegedly caused to the Austrian economy by the accident at the Chernobyl AES. One would like to ask Mr. Lauder whether he has heard that according to the conclusions of both the IAEA and the WHO, the level of radiation in Europe after the accident did not exceed the health safety limits.

Mr. Lauder is angry. He is clearly displeased that the Austrians are not following his "recommendations."

/8309

CSO: 1807/387

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### TABLE OF CONTENTS: LATINSKAYA AMERIKA NO 4, 1986

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 86 pp 3-4

[Text] Special issue, devoted to the 25th anniversary of the Institute of Latin America of the USSR Academy of Sciences [Prepared by ILA Staff Members]

#### Contents

#### BASED ON MATERIALS OF THE 27th CPSU CONGRESS

V.V. Volskiy. Latin America in the Present-day World 5

#### LEADING AREAS OF RESEARCH

L.L. Klochkovskiy, I.K. Sheremetev. The Contradictions of Capitalist Development 21

B.M. Merin, Yu.I. Vizgunova. The Present Stage of the Democratic Anti-imperialist Struggle 33

A.N. Glinkin. Latin America in the International Relations of the 20th Century 47

A.D. Bekarevich. Cuba: The Experience of Socialist Construction 59

#### NEW SUBJECTS AND STUDIES

K.S. Tarasov. Specific Features of the Development of the Region's Productive Forces 67

V.M. Davydov. How Economic Prospects Are Seen: the Horizon of the Year 2000 73

Yu.G. Onufriyev. The Agrarian Sector: An Evaluation of Trends 82

#### FUNDAMENTAL-APPLIED PROBLEMS

A. I. Sizonenko. USSR-Latin America: Political Ties 88

The Focus of Attention: the Spiritual Life of the Region	93
V.P. Belyayev. Questions of Education: Complexity and Diversity	110
Yu.A. Zubritskiy. Current Aspects of National-Ethnic Development	117
THE SCHOLARLY LIFE OF THE INSTITUTE	
P.P. Yakovlev. A Creative Atmosphere, High Standards	124
K.A. Torkova. Cooperation Is Expanding	127
I.Ye. Shokina. The 3d Soviet-Argentine Symposium	130
K.A. Surova. ILA Scientific Works (1981-1985)	133
ILA PUBLICATIONS	
N.V. Kalashnikov. Publications for 1984-1985	136
A.I. Stroganov. "Proletariat i revolyutsionnyy protsess v Latinskoy Amerike [The Proletariat and Revolutionary Process in Latin America]. Moscow, "Nauka", 1985	140
Ye.N. Lisitsyn. "Latinskaya Amerika: ekologiya i politika" [Latin America: Ecology and Politics] by T.S. Gavrilova and K.S. Tarasov, Editor-in-Chief V.V. Volskiy. Moscow, "Nauka", 1985	142
A.D. Dridzo. "Strany Karibskogo basseyna. Tendentsii ekonomicheskogo i sotsialno-politicheskogo razvitiya" [The Caribbean Countries. Economic and Socio-Political Development Trends]. Editor-in-Chief V.V. Volskiy, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Moscow, "Nauka", 1985	143
COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1986	
8543	
CSO: 1807/267	

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### VOLSKIY ANALYZES, CHARACTERIZES LATIN AMERICAN CAPITALISM

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 86 pp 5-20

[Article by V.V. Volskiy: "Latin America in the Present-day World"]

[Text] An epochal event of our time--the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union--has been inscribed forever in the history of mankind. It opened up a new stage in the Soviet people's struggle to improve that society, which was created for the first time on our planet by Great October; it opened up a very important and decisive stage on the way to the realization of the cherished dream of building a community of people based on genuine equality, fraternity and harmony. This congress of creation and peace approved the new edition of the CPSU Program--a profoundly scientific document which encompasses the historical experience and collective wisdom of the party; it adopted a concrete plan for the development of our country for the coming five-year plan and for the future up to the year 2000.

As the leaders of the fraternal communist and workers parties emphasized in their presentations at this forum, the 27th CPSU Congress also has enormous international significance: it demonstrated once again to the world the great creative force of Marxism-Leninism, as well as the advantages, the vitality and confident tread of a socialist society.

The new edition of the CPSU Program is the starting point and an effective instrument for the analysis of the current international situation. The development of this document reflects the results and the level which the Marxist social sciences have reached. At the same time scholars face the task of making a further and even deeper study, as well as an all-around analysis of the experience of world development and of the processes taking place in the communist, workers and national-liberation movements.

Soviet Latin American specialists are also summing up the results of their work; they are attempting to draw conclusions and interpret the results of a large number of fruitful discussions and creative research. The most basic and important problems of Latin American studies include the determination of the following: Latin America's place in the present-day world; the general and the particular in the development of its countries; the specific features which characterize the general crisis of capitalism in the region; and the basic



trends in the strategy of the opposing class forces, i.e., the forces of imperialism and the anti-imperialist movements.

### Similarity and Diversity

Latin America, which in a broad geographical understanding includes the Caribbean, encompasses about four-tenths of the countries and territories--from the smallest island states to such major states as Mexico and Brazil. Even one glance at the map gives an idea of their diversity: they are large and small, densely and sparsely populated, flat and mountainous, rich in minerals and virtually devoid of them, they are island and continental in nature, water-logged and drought-stricken, tropical and cool, steppe and forest; each of them possesses a unique selection of features and conditions for peoples' lives. The specific features of international relations are superimposed upon the variegation of this map and give rise to modifications in the characteristics of societal development. In the end all this contributes to the formation of the various types of countries.

V.I. Lenin laid the foundation for the Marxist typology of states in the capitalist world. First he "divided the nations into the oppressing and the oppressed." (1) Lenin emphasized that this division, which arises on the historical basis of monopolistic capitalism, "constitutes the essence of imperialism" (2) and can disappear only with the disappearance of imperialism itself.

The new edition of the CPSU Program, which follows the Leninist teachings and reflects the realities of today's world, characterizes the situation in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the following way: by taking advantage of the economic and technological dependence, as well as the unequal position of the liberated countries in the world capitalist economy, imperialism mercilessly exploits them, collecting billions in tribute and draining the economy of these states. Moreover, the Program directs particular attention to the enormous and growing gap in the economic development levels between the industrial countries of capital and the majority of the liberated states. Thus the Leninist division of the capitalist world into two unequal parts has retained its force, and Latin American continues to belong to the exploited.

Among the many synonyms which are used in the current literature to signify these countries (poorly developed economically, dependent, developing states, "third world," etc.), the term "liberated countries" was chosen for the new edition of the CPSU Program. With regard to all those countries which we call liberated today, this term not only reminds us of the harsh darkness of the colonial past and of the very high price which was paid for political independence, but also points to a heritage which has not yet been overcome and to the fact that political liberation alone is far from enough to put an end to imperialist exploitation and to acquire genuine independence. And in this regard Latin America is by no means the exception. Indeed, a majority of its states in their century and a half of history since the time of liberation confirms this rule. The new edition of the CPSU Program notes that even countries which gained state independence a long time ago, such as the Latin

1. V.I. Lenin. Complete Works, v. 27, p63.

2. Ibid.

American states, have been forced to carry out an intense struggle against the domination of monopolies from the USA and other imperialist states.

The community of these countries is determined by the uniqueness of their characteristic features and by the specific features of capitalist development: 1) the uncompensated export of a substantial portion of their total social product--in the form of profits and interest, through the transfer prices of intra-company trade by the multinational corporations, etc.; 2) the multistructured nature of their economies, reflecting capitalism's adaptation to co-existence with precapitalist structures and remnants; 3) the relative weakness and undeveloped nature of local capital, the limited nature of its opportunities not only on the world market but also on the national one, the continuous existence based on the above of conflicts between local capital and the multinational corporations and multinational banks; and 4) the relatively large role of the state sector of the economy, which is formed on the one hand, as the result of the desire to compensate for the weakness of national private capital and to ensure support for the latter, as well as its survival in competition with the multinational corporations, and on the other hand, as a result of the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses.

Naturally, in any given countries of the region these features are combined and manifested with varying degrees of intensity and in various forms. But the main point that is reflected in all four general features is the obvious link, the functional inverse relationship between the development of domestic factors and the positions of imperialism. For this reason, if one talks in a more generalized way, the camp of the liberated states includes all those for whom the conflicts with imperialism are the number-one unresolved national task.

The process of differentiating the vast expanse of the liberated countries is very important both for scientific knowledge and for practical conclusions; it should begin with their division into two groups: the countries of relatively mature capitalism and the young nations which are being formed. The first have traversed a relatively long path of capitalist evolution; by the beginning of the imperialist epoch they were not colonies as a rule, but they were lagging behind in their development and for this reason they were an object of economic division and the intensive penetration by foreign capital. This accelerated the development of capitalist relations (despite the weakness of local capital), and in the end it led to the establishment of their dominance and the completion of the formation of certain types of dependent capitalist nations. The second were liberated from the colonial yoke comparatively recently; foreign capital investments in these countries were not large, and the main point is that they were not woven into the economic fabric; they became something "external," a kind of "enclave." Capitalist relations here did not become dominant, while the formation of independent states, which accelerated the process of nation formation, sometimes acquires an extremely complex and unhealthy nature.

Nearly all the states of Latin America belong in the first group. The most developed of them fully approached the middle-level development countries of



Southern Europe a long time ago, but the barrier of dependence does not allow them to go farther; it dooms them to skid, to a difficult and prolonged structural crisis. At the same time the region has states in which capitalism has matured comparatively recently and under completely different conditions. In a word, the means and rate of capitalist development in the region's countries are extremely diverse. There are differences both in the positions of imperialism and the alignment of class forces. All this diversity among the liberated countries of relatively mature capitalism can be reduced to seven types. Short descriptions of them are provided below:

Key countries, competitor countries--Brazil, Mexico. They possess, although for different reasons, the greatest economic potential in the "third world," and in terms of GNP volume they are in the top 10 states of the capitalist world--they produce about 40 percent of the industrial output of all the liberated countries; they have a diversified production structure comparable to that of the developed states (machine building, for example, accounts for more than 20 percent). Both countries have the greatest scientific-technical potential in the exploited world. Finally, large-scale capital, both state and private, has developed here and increasingly lets its presence be known.

Imperialism, and primarily American capitalism, frequently views Brazil and Mexico as its competitors and rivals, especially in Latin America. But it is for precisely this reason that imperialism is constantly being refined to prevent these countries from going beyond the orbit of its control and exploitation, to slow up their development and to direct it toward the intensification of dependence. Among the developing countries Brazil and Mexico have the largest concentrations of direct foreign capital investment; the multinationals here control all the key branches of the economy. These countries have the world's largest foreign debt; they are the biggest payers of multi-billion dollar tribute in the entire "dollar empire." The struggle for their complete liberation will be difficult and accessible only to the united forces of an overwhelming national majority.

Countries of "overripe" dependent capitalism--Argentina, Uruguay. These two states, which are the most developed countries in Latin America in terms of per capita indicators, demonstrate graphically to the liberated countries the lack of promise in development along the capitalist path. Under conditions of dependence, these highly urbanized countries, which have large immigrant populations and very rich agricultural resources, were the first in the region to start down the path of capitalist development. The most dynamic wave of industrialization took place here even before the First World War. But the farther development went, the more the foreign branches meshed with local capital and merged with the surviving archaic agricultural structure, the more difficult and contradictory became the historical path of these countries, and beginning in the 50's they entered a phase of difficult structural crisis. The capacity of their comparatively small domestic markets was exhausted, and their further expansion required the implementation of profound reforms, especially agrarian reform. Foreign capital also lost interest in new investment in their economies: it had reached saturation in the domestic market, while production for export was not profitable due to a relatively high standard of living and the corresponding cost of manpower. In the

international division of labor both countries remained agrarian. Moreover, in terms of GNP volume Argentina fell from 12th to 25th place in the capitalist world during the years 1960-1982, and in terms of the value of exports it fell from 18th to 37th. An important positive factor in the dialectics of the development of these states is the significant role of the proletariat, including the rural proletariat, in the growing struggle against the domination of imperialism, and for social progress.

The countries of "large-enclave" development of capitalism--Venezuela, Chile. The decisive role in the destruction of precapitalist relations and in the formation of commodity-monetary relations in these countries was played by the massive invasion of foreign capital related to the exploitation of deposits which were unique for their time: at first deposits of saltpeter and then of copper in Chile and oil in Venezuela. A feature of the social-economic structure of these states is that a miniscule fraction of the gainfully-employed population (less than 1 percent) provides most of the social product, which ensures the highest level of state income in Latin America; as it moves into the redistribution process, it exerts a substantial influence on all spheres of the economy and society as a whole. This leads to the accelerated development of the infrastructure and, to a certain degree, of the processing industry--of course, under the control of and with the participation of foreign capital. The agrarian sector, which has not experienced serious transformations of precapitalist land ownership (if one does not count attempts made by Popular Unity in Chile), on the contrary, is falling into decline, and masses of the rural population add to the ranks of the marginals and "cuentapropistas." The detachments of miners and oil workers, which are large in terms of economic significance, but small in terms of size have achieved as a result of an extended struggle a higher wage level than in all other branches of the economy, and they have turned into a social source for the dissemination of petty bourgeois ideas of caste and economism in the workers movement. The middle strata play an important inertial role in the social structure of these countries. All this is complicated further by the spread of nationalism as a result of the growing influx of immigrants from the poorer neighboring states. A very great role here is played by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, which has acquired a place at the state "feeding trough" and which easily makes compromises and even deals with imperialism when there is even the slightest threat of a loss of power. At the same time each of these countries has a great anti-imperialist potential: for many decades they have been subjected to large-scale robbery, and for this reason they have not had the opportunity to leave the ranks of the main debtors among the liberated countries.

Countries of externally-oriented adaptation of capitalism--Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay. These are countries which are in the middle in terms of population size (with a significant Indian and Metis population) and resource potential; they have undergone an extensive evolution from patriarchy to capitalist modernization deformed by foreign capital and the world economy. For a long time the war for independence ensured the domination of the creole Latifundists. Its results, expressed in the words of V.I. Lenin, drew these states "...into the exchange of goods but still not into capitalist production." (3) Here, more than in any other countries of the

3. V.I. Lenin. Complete Works, V. 30 p. 35.

region, such remnants of feudalism as working off debts by labor, sharecropping and casicismo, etc. remained. The processes of original accumulation were slowed up by the penetration of foreign companies and banks, while the commodity production of agricultural output and mineral raw materials took a long time to develop and was oriented exclusively toward the foreign market. The natural resources which were discovered did not attract the attention of foreign capital. Industrialization was started very late as an import-substituting process and was significantly held up by the narrowness of domestic markets. The local versions of the "Prussian" path of capitalist development in agriculture and the "demographic explosion" led to the rapid growth of the relatively agrarian overpopulation; ever newer masses of people were thrown onto the labor market without adequate employment opportunities. The main problem which states of this kind face is the search for the means of existence for an enormous number of the unemployed. It is being resolved through adaptation to the needs of the capitalist world market. First, of all they have been turned into the main suppliers of manpower not only to the USA and Canada, but also to neighboring, relatively richer states. In recent years the multinationals have evaluated the cheapness and productivity of labor in these countries and begun to transfer to them labor-intensive production units and operations for processing intermediate products on the basis of models and licenses issued by the MNC's for mass standardized output to be exported to the mother countries. The process of introducing the "industrias maquiladoras" has been encompassed by Ecuador, Peru and especially Colombia. But as the crisis of the early 80's has shown, this trend does not open up new prospects; it does not make a substantial contribution either to the resolution of economic problems or to the resolution of the employment problems. For this reason it is here that all kinds of "illegal business" flourish; directed and encouraged by major capital and the mafia of the imperialist centers, they include the production and sale of narcotics, contraband trade, etc. Crime "records" are being set. The class situation is characterized by the constantly growing but still relatively small industrial proletariat (this is explained by the fact that its most active segment looks to immigration for improvement in its life). The very poor majority of the middle strata provide both desperate extremists and members of various radical groups and currents. The commercial-land and financial oligarchy looks for an escape in the dictatorship and "the improvement of relations" with foreign capital. The political diversity is complicated by the unresolved nationalities question, by the multilingualism and ignorance of the Indian masses, and by the growing ethnoregionalism.

Small countries with a dependent plantation economy--Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Dominican Republic and Haiti. These are the most "appropriated" part of the "dollar empire" and the part which the United States has intervened in the most. The fruitlessness of the bourgeois democratic movements due to the constant and direct interference by the USA in the role of policeman and the population's attachment to the land--all this has helped to preserve the colonial specialization of these countries in the production of agricultural goods for export. At the same time the proximity to the North American market; the sway of American capital in agriculture; the combination of foreign plantations with local latifundia and of hired workers with the mass of "mini-fundists," who carry out natural farming, have all



resulted in the relatively broad introduction of application of commodity and monetary relations. Capitalist relations are most developed in Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic and the least developed in Honduras and Haiti. The lion's share of all output is directly produced or bought up and exported by U.S. fruit, sugar, coffee, cotton, livestock and other companies. Among all the liberated countries this group of states is distinguished by its high proportion of agricultural output for export. The industry and infrastructure are poorly developed. The extremely low standard of living of the working people, the management practices of the trade-land oligarchy and American capital, the cruelest of the pro-American dictatorships in some of the countries of this group, the cynical imperial policy of the USA--all of this has more than once aroused the peoples of these countries to struggle for true national dependence, democracy and social progress.

The victory of the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua in 1979 opened up new prospects for the states of this type.

The small countries characterized by the "concessional development" of capitalism--Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana and Surinam. These former colonies acquired independence only recently. But the major reserves of useful minerals discovered here have attracted capital from the mother countries and resulted in the accelerated development of capitalism. The concessions of the aluminum and oil corporations have become the main factors in this development. Everything else, including the construction of the petroleum refineries for distillation and re-export of imported oil in Trinidad and an aluminum plant in Surinam, is subordinated to their interests. At the present time the economy of these countries depends completely on world market conditions. One of the major problems which they face is the uncompleted process of nation formation; manpower for the concessions has been recruited from Asian and African countries, and this has led to great ethnic diversity in the population, which is frequently incompatible in terms of religion and customs.

One of the countries, Guyana, as a way of freeing itself from foreign control and achieving social progress, has chosen an orientation toward the building of so-called cooperative socialism and has made substantial changes: it has nationalized foreign concessions, ensured that the state sector has decisive positions in the economy and carried out agrarian reform.

The countries of "tax heaven" or "apartment landlords"--the Bahamas, Barbados, Grand Cayman and Panama. These are small islands or coastal countries, located at the crossroads of various routes. Lying beyond the borders of Latin America are more than a dozen other states of this type. Despite the fact that only some of them are still colonies, the MNC's and MNB's are actually the masters in the formally independent countries; while paying certain sums to the local powers, they utilize the territories of these countries for their own purposes--as "hotels," which attract foreign tourists, as locations for corporate and bank headquarters outside the reach of the tax organs in the mother countries, and as a "flag of convenience" for registering the enormous fleets of the mother countries. The characteristic features of these states and territories are: the extreme liberalism of their

economic legislation and noninterference in the affairs of foreign capital, a developed system of domestic security and the presence of powerful U.S. and English military bases, a developed infrastructure (international communications, ports, airports), use of the U.S. dollar instead of the national currencies and bilingualism. In the life of Panama, in addition to all of the above, the inter-ocean canal plays a special role, both as the main foreign enterprise and as part of a territory which has broken away. In social-political terms these countries by no means always represent a safe refuge for imperialism. In particular, there was evidence of this in the 1968 uprising of the Panamanian people against American domination.

#### Latin America and the General Crisis of Capitalism

In comparison with the other regions of the world liberated from colonialism Latin America has advanced farther along the path of integration into the system of modern-day capitalism. The exploitation of the Latin American peoples, which is the most refined and largest in scale, is the main condition for the existence of the "dollar empire." All this has inevitably led to the synchronization of the social processes taking place in the region with those which are characteristic of the centers of capitalism and to Latin America's inclusion in the general crisis of capitalism. In this regard, a substantial change has taken place in the nature of the influence exerted by the general crisis on the Latin American countries.

In recent decades there has been a sharp acceleration in the process of the internationalization of production and the transnationalization of all branches of the economy in the region's countries. Further, it is important to emphasize not only the quantitative growth in the share of the MNC's and MNB's in the economy, their occupation of key positions and the export of a significant portion of the social product due to the control of the national centers over decision making. Something greater has taken place: quantity has become quality. The branches of the multinational corporations and banks have so profoundly and inextricably entered into the economic fabric of these countries, they have achieved such a close and complex interweaving of their own interests with the interests of the local land, commercial, financial and sometimes even industrial oligarchy that today one can talk about the "interiorization" of imperialism in the countries of the region. And it is this which has determined the nature of the manifestation of the general crisis of capitalism in Latin America. With the worsening of the crisis imperialism has not only jeopardized the entire economy of the centers as well as that of the developing countries, it has also tried to ease its own lot by shifting the main burden onto the latter.

The new edition of the CPSU Program contains a laconic but expressive picture of the present-day capitalist world filled with acute conflicts. A close reading of its text and an analysis of the concrete features of the present-day world shows convincingly that the current worsening of the general crisis undoubtedly is stage-like in nature. The world crisis of the early 80's was not simply another shake up in the capitalist economy. Both in terms of the breadth and the depth of the shock in all spheres of social development it was the result of the culmination of the fundamental and very deep contradictions

of imperialism; it was the result of the total effect of shifts which have accumulated in the last two decades. Moreover, it is perfectly obvious that the main conflicts of present-day capitalism have become characteristic of Latin America as well and that they are the cause of its unprecedented crisis.

One can note a sharp increase in at least four global contradictions which have resulted in the stage-like nature of the current worsening of the general crisis of capitalism.

According to the new edition of the Program, the main and most all-encompassing contradiction which has been inherent in imperialism since the time of its emergence is the conflict between the enormously expanded production forces and capitalist production relations, a conflict which is becoming ever more acute. The first part of this situation is widely known and needs no commentary. Perhaps it is just worth recalling that in the last quarter of a century there has been rapid growth in production forces in Latin America as well: the employable population has nearly tripled; the rate of industrial growth has been a little higher than the world average, while machine building's share of industry has more than doubled here; and completely new industries--aviation, instrument making and electronics--have emerged.

However, the development of capitalist production relations undermines and reduces to naught these achievements. The world crisis of the 80's has revealed, firstly, a tendency toward a sharp worsening of the position of the working people throughout the capitalist world. In 1973-1983 the number of unemployed in the OESR [Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development] countries reached more than 33 million people; moreover, for the first time in all of history the growth of unemployment has continued even into the periods of economic improvement. In the USA, the wealthiest imperialist country, the number of unemployed and homeless has reached a record level, real wages have fallen, a "parallel market" in manpower has developed with incomparably worse employment conditions for Latin American immigrants and the colored population. And the position of the working people in Latin America is unspeakable: the number of unemployed is constantly growing, inflation and prices are galloping, and industrial capacities which are unutilized due to the spasmodic shrinking of the market are reaching 30-50 percent.

Secondly, expenditures for restraining, subordinating and destroying peoples--militarization, the arms race, the development of mechanisms for repression, the "cold war," the promotion of local conflicts, the payment of mercenaries, etc. has reached an unprecedented level. In order to get some idea of the damage which these unproductive as well as anti-social expenditures inflict on the world economy, it is sufficient to say that the the direct military budget of the USA alone, plus the CIA budget and the so-called "aid" to foreign states, this year approached the total of the entire foreign debt of Latin America. And the Latin American countries have found themselves drawn into the arms race and burdened with enormous expenditures for the creation of "their own" military-industrial complexes.



Thirdly, parasitism, which is always inherent in capitalism, has acquired unprecedented scale. The rapid growth of the MNCs' control over the economy of the capitalist world in recent decades has taken place to a significant degree through the nearly-explosive expansion in the amount and the acceleration in the turnover of international lending capital, which has grown in the course of the increasing exploitation of the liberated countries, as well as by the the gigantic speculative maneuvers by the petroleum monopolies and the multinational banks. The lion's share of this capital, which is based on petroleum income and "pure" financial operations has virtually no material equivalent: it was fictitious; it was that "solution" which "washed away" the real labor of hundreds of millions of people from the debtor countries.

New misfortunes descended upon them as a result of the growth of interest rates in the USA, the sharp increase in the cost of international credit and the flight of capital. Meanwhile, tens of billions of even emptier "comparison dollars," units of "special borrowing rights," which are put out by the U.S.-controlled International Monetary Fund, began to circulate on the world credit market. The growth of speculative parasitism has not only resulted in the excessive expansion of the scale, the strength and significance of lending capital, but has also changed its geography. In the USA, for example, 7.6 percent of all bank loans and credits went abroad in 1970; in 1980 this figure had reached 26 percent of a sharply increased total sum, while the nine largest private banks, which "specialize" in Latin America, placed about 85 percent of their loans in Mexico and Brazil. The parasitical nature of the transformation of foreign capital in Latin America is obvious: in 1960-1965 for every dollar of direct capital investment in the economy lending capital accounted for only 9 cents, while in 1979 it accounted for \$3.5. From this kind of development of the international economic relations of capitalism it is not difficult to deduce a statistical formula for the evolution which has led Latin America to catastrophe: in 1970-1981 the processing industry, the most dynamic branch of the region's economy, grew 5.4 percent annually, direct U.S. private capital investment in this sector grew by 10.1 percent, foreign debt grew by 21.9 percent and payments of debt interest grew by 31.5 percent.

A critical point has been reached in the confrontation between neocolonialism, imperialism's desire for unlimited economic expansion and for the expanded reproduction of relations of dependence and of dominance, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the objective and subjective impossibility for the liberated countries to continue their exploitation within the framework of the existing parameters and the desire of these countries for genuine independence and social progress. It is well known that in its thirst for profit imperialism knows no limits. What is new is that its appetites are no longer in line with the scale--which is growing at an unbelievably rapid rate--of theft from the weaker countries. "There is definitely a causal link between the trillion dollar debt of these countries and the more than trillion dollar increase in U.S. military expenditures in the last decade," notes the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Further, the extent to which the "third world," and Latin America in particular, has been bled white even today makes dozens of countries face the question of their self preservation and their survival. It is truly monstrous that in 1978-1984 Latin America paid out for its debts and the interest on them an amount equal to the entire debt by the end of this period, while the debt during this time had doubled! For every Latin American, including newborns, the foreign debt today exceeds \$1,000, the annual per capita income. In Latin America an understanding of the dilemma is developing: either it unites and closes ranks with the countries of Asia and Africa to stop the escalation of the theft, or it faces the prospect of serious social explosions with unforeseen consequences. Herein lies the essence of the global exacerbation of one of the main conflicts of the imperialist system: the parasitism of the centers has become incompatible with the problem of hunger in the periphery.

A special role is played by the growth and exacerbation of the conflicts between the USA and the rest of the capitalist world, between the desire of the imperialist giant to establish a "pax americana" on the planet and the objective increase in the tendency toward the decline of the "dollar empire," which is vividly manifested in intra-imperialist rivalry, in the increasingly bold refusal on the part of a number of U.S. allies to follow its dictates, and in the growth of anti-American sentiments in the "third world" countries.

The U.S. positions in the world capitalist economy have been quite strongly squeezed by its competitors. The U.S. share of industry in the capitalist world declined from 56 percent in 1948 to 30 percent in 1981, while Japan, which is now in second place, increased its share during this time from 3 to 17 percent. In the list of the world's 500 largest corporations published by FORTUNE magazine, the number of American corporations fell from 300 to 215 in the years 1968 to 1982, while the number of Japanese corporations grew from 43 to 76. The number of Japanese banks among the world's 100 largest banks has reached 24; it has exceeded the number of American banks two-fold. In Latin America the results of intra-imperialist rivalry are even more vivid: in the period 1966-1984 direct American capital investment in the region grew 2.6-fold (from \$11.4 to \$31 billion), while the Japanese investment grew 63-fold (from \$0.2 to \$13 billion) and reached second place. The positions of the FRG, France, Italy, Sweden and the Netherlands have grown somewhat more slowly but also extremely extensively. They do not by any means always support U.S. policy in Latin America; they frequently condemn such actions as its seizure of Grenada, the undeclared war against Nicaragua, its support for Pinochet and the Cuban blockade.

When one talks about growth in the struggle against U.S. imperial policy in the liberated countries, it should be noted that since the defeat of the dirty war in Vietnam it has moved virtually uninterrupted along an ascending path. In Latin America, the main patrimony of the "dollar empire," one cannot name a single major event or process in the domestic life of these countries nor a single sphere of international relations in which the increasingly irreconcilable national interests of the Latin American states and the USA do not come into conflict. The victory of the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua not only opened up the path to freedom for this small country but also became



a demonstration of the heroism, pride and dignity of all the Latin American peoples. It is for precisely this reason that the American leadership in the OAS has stopped working, while the community of Latin American nations continues to support Nicaragua and searches persistently for its own ways to eliminate conflict in Central America. The events of February 1986 in Haiti and the flight of the tyrant-butcher Duvalier on an American military jet opened up a new page in the history of the failure of reactionary pro-American dictatorships to the south of the Rio Bravo.

The profound crisis of American domination in the world gives rise to a chain reaction which is extremely dangerous for the entire planet: the USA tries to compensate for the decline of its economic might and political prestige by increases in its strength, by constant threats to use it, by the unrestrained export of counterrevolution and by international state terrorism. In this epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism the shifts in the alignment of forces in favor of socialism are taking place at a steady pace in the course of the historical competition of the two opposing systems. Despite the ideological war unleashed by imperialism on an unheard of scale, as well as the various types of intervention and conspiracies, blockades and sanctions, ever more and more peoples are rejecting capitalism as a faith; they do not want to link their prospects for development to it; they are persistently drawn toward that type of social order and to those kind of social relations which have already been developed in the socialist countries.

The victory and consolidation of the socialist order in Cuba have enormous significance for the fate of Latin America. Against the background of a most acute crisis and the depressing, gloomy prospects for the rest of Latin America, the results of the 3d Congress of the Cuban Communist Party demonstrated to the entire world 1) great dynamism and stability in its economic development; 2) social successes, which so far have been unattainable by its neighbors in the region; and 3) a position firmer than ever before and high prestige in international relations. After all, it is precisely for this reason that Cuba's inspiring example has become so unbearable.

#### The Crisis and the Positions of the Class Forces

The weight of foreign economic factors is the current worsening of the general crisis of capitalism, which has engulfed Latin America as well, is very great, but this does not mean that for the region's countries the crisis is something external or something reflected, or that it can be overcome easily with an improvement in business conditions in the centers of imperialism. This is essentially a crisis of the entire path which Latin America has taken in recent decades.

In the economic area this crisis has struck the Latin American countries more profoundly and acutely than the crisis of the 30's. This is stated directly in the Quito Declaration, which was adopted at the 1984 Latin American economic summit conference: "Latin America and the Caribbean states are experiencing the most serious and profound economic and social crisis of our present century." The absolute decline in production has encompassed practically all the countries of the region and in some of them it has been prolonged to an

unprecedented degree. Argentine industry, for example, has experienced this decline for six out of the last 10 years. The debt crisis which has erupted in these years has brought a majority of the countries to the brink of catastrophe. And all this has vividly demonstrated the groundlessness of the concepts which were used in the attempt to prove the possibility of the region's forward development: the unrealistic and Utopian nature of the ideas of desarrrolism, the complete bankruptcy of the doctrine of "neoliberalism" or "monetarism," which proved to be truly diversionary, the disappointment of the hopes held out for both the strategy of "import replacement" and "export oriented" industrialization.

In the social area the present crisis is characterized by the growth of unemployment and incomplete employment, the sharp polarization and distribution of national income, the decline in the living standards of the broad popular masses, the acceleration of the processes of marginalization and pauperization in the so-called "informal" sectors of employment. The crisis has revealed clearly the significant expansion which has taken place in recent decades in the social base of exploitation, and it has in fact set the Latin American nations against "interiorized" imperialism.

In the political area the crisis has struck first of all the societal structures, which are oriented toward a direct alliance with imperialism, the military-fascist dictatorships and the rightist authoritarian regimes based on "national security" doctrines. It has sharply increased the struggle of the working masses for their own rights and significantly increased the role of that struggle in determining the destiny of their own countries. It has--for good reasons--shifted to the left the political orientation of the middle strata, but at the same time it has intensified their political-ideological polarization, having resulted in a new wave of activity related to the emergence and development of ultra-left and radical-democratic, as well as neofascist organizations and currents. The main result of the crisis in this area may consist in the fact that it has shown as never before that a fundamental watershed in the political struggle in Latin America divides the pro-imperialist and anti-imperialist forces.

Despite the fact that the class and political forces of Latin America react differently to the crisis and are looking for their own ways out of it, imperialism, and especially American imperialism, is extremely concerned with the situation which has developed in the region, especially the incandescent atmosphere of protest against exploitation and the policy of diktat. The predominant lines of the economic strategy which imperialism takes in the region's countries can be reduced to three main goals: to perpetuate the debt load as a primary channel for shifting profits and as an instrument of economic control; to use that debt as a lock-pick to open up more widely the doors of the national economies for multinational capital; to dismantle the main obstacle on the path to the achievement of the first two goals--the state sector of the economy--which is the main competitor and, under certain conditions, the main economic force of opposition to foreign capital. However, in this regard, one must not forget that imperialism is not homogeneous, even within the limits of the countries taken individually, that its strategy and decisions with regard to the problems of Latin America are

formed not only from the desire to unite to exploit that part of the world but also from the inevitable rivalry to divide and redivide the output. Those forces whose positions have grown and strengthened in recent years are inclined to make certain concessions and to look for compromise with the bourgeoisie of the Latin American countries, utilizing at times the mediation of social democracy for this purpose. And, in contrast, those forces, which are experiencing a severe crisis in their domination of the world are trying to turn to their advantage those tendencies which have developed by making imperial claims from a position of strength, by escalating violence and by gambling on war.

The peoples of Latin America and their progressive forces are looking for their own solution to the problem of crisis. But this time the worsening of the social crisis of capitalism has struck and weakened the most reactionary elites, which are most closely related to imperialism; it has created a favorable situation for the discovery of a democratic anti-imperialist alternative to the crisis. The most important and difficult problem that lies on this path is to overcome the dispersion of the progressive, democratic and anti-imperialist forces both within national boundaries but also on the scale of the entire region, a dispersion which imperialism and the local reaction is extremely interested in. In this sense one must not fail to say--although this sounds paradoxical--that the repressive military-dictatorial regimes have provided many lessons to the democratic forces and that in the end these regimes have helped the latter to unify, grow and to close the ranks of the opposition and subsequently to achieve victory in a number of countries. The long history of American imperialism's expansion in Latin America in general and its expansion in recent times in particular have also provided many lessons to the USA's neighbors in the hemisphere. In these countries the ideas of cooperation and solidarity are growing stronger, as is the consciousness that regional affairs can and should be resolved by Latin America itself, without instructions and dictates from Washington. This is seen in such facts as the creation of the Latin American Economic Council, the activities and the viability--despite tricks by American diplomacy--of the "Contadora" and "Cartagena" groups, the increasingly active participation of Latin America in the non-aligned movement, etc.

The Soviet people and its vanguard, the CPSU, as mentioned in the new edition of the party program, support the just struggle of the Latin American countries against imperialism and the yoke of the multi-national monopolies, the struggle for the sovereign right to dispose of their own resources, to reorganize international relations on the basis of equal rights and democracy, the struggle for the establishment of a new international economic order and for salvation from the debt servitude imposed by imperialism. As the historical experience of the Latin American countries shows, political and economic ties with the Soviet Union contribute to the strengthening of their independence. Based on the fundamental principles of our state's foreign policy, as noted in the materials of the 27th CPSU Congress, the Soviet people strives for friendship and cooperation with peoples throughout the world, including those in Latin America.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1986

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### STRATEGY OF DEMOCRATIC FORCES IN LA ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 86 pp 33-46

[Article by B.M. Merin and Yu.I. Vizgunova: "The Current Stage of the Democratic Anti-imperialist Struggle"]

[Excerpts] The 80's have signified a boundary marking the beginning of a qualitatively new stage in the struggle of the Latin American peoples against imperialism and the local reaction. This is related to the objective processes which are taking place in the world, to the legitimate aspiration of the region's countries for genuine economic and political independence, to the growing role of the working class in the liberation, anti-imperialist movement and to the increase in revolutionary action. Of no small significance is the fact that conflicts with the USA have reached the critical point: it continues to view the region as within the sphere of its traditional economic, political and military-strategic dominance. The growth of foreign indebtedness serves as the most vivid expression of the predatory U.S. policy in Latin America. The debt, which has reached an astronomical sum, has practically paralyzed normal economic activity in the Latin American countries. Under these conditions the subcontinent, where the structural crisis of the deformed development of capitalism continues to deepen, has become an area in which the basic contradictions of the world capitalist system are actively manifested. The struggle over ways to resolve the structural crisis, which is closely related to the search for development alternatives, has also become considerably more acute. The inextricable link between the anti-imperialist movement and the social and class struggle has become more and more obvious.

The objective basis for the new tendencies in the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle is to be found in the substantial changes in the arrangement of class forces and the sharp exacerbation of the social conflicts and antagonisms, which have occurred under the influence of the monopolization of the economy, the concentration of capital, the increasing sway of the multinational corporations (MNC's) and of scientific-technical progress. All this could not fail to be reflected in the political positions of the dominating classes. The upper bourgeoisie is attempting to find those power structures which would protect its interests in the most reliable manner, taking into account the new alignment of political forces both within the respective countries as well as in the international arena.



## Growth in the Role of the Working Class

With the intensive capitalist development taking place in a majority of the Latin American states, new categories of working people are being drawn into the sphere of capitalist exploitation; this is being accompanied by noticeable changes in the composition of people in the hired labor category, especially in the working class. By 1980 the number of hired employees in Latin America had reached 65-67 million people; they constituted up to 60 percent of the gainfully-employed population on average throughout the region and from 75 to 88 percent in the most developed countries. The working class, which has grown quantitatively and qualitatively, and which has changed under the influence of accelerated capitalist development, includes 45-47 million people (45 percent of the economically active population). The industrial nucleus of the proletariat (18 million people) has grown stronger. With the expansion of the modern branches of industry and the modernization of traditional ones, the number of skilled cadre workers, who are concentrated to an ever increasing degree at large-scale monopolistic enterprises, is growing.

The tendency toward the expansion of the social boundaries of the working class is developing. The fact that technical specialists and white-collar workers are moving closer to the workers in terms of the nature of their work and the quality of life is leading to an increase in the social base of the workers movement. With the appearance of capitalist-type farms in agriculture, a large detachment of an agricultural proletariat and semiproletariat (16 million people) has been formed. Within this group, permanent workers constitute 45-50 percent (7-8 million people). Farm laborers, day laborers and "family workers" make up the rest of the people in the hired labor category.

The changes in the structure of the Latin American proletariat are leading to a strengthening of the objective tendencies toward growth in the influence of the working class on the entire course of social development. At the same time the increasing complexity of the structure, the growing unevenness in the development of individual detachments and strata of the proletariat create no small difficulties for the workers movement. Ideas which are frequently permeated with petty bourgeois prejudices are introduced into the proletarian milieu. The socio-economic conditions in which the formation of the working class takes place stimulate its development as a class with several strata; these conditions also give rise to serious problems such as mass unemployment, marginalization, etc. The masses of the "new" proletariat and semiproletariat are poorly organized both professionally and politically. Frequently they are utilized by the bourgeoisie to put pressure on the organized workers movement, to spread reformist ideology, to create a split and to disseminate among the workers attitudes of petty bourgeois revolutionaryism and anarcho-syndicalism, which frequently acquire a nationalist tinge. And it is to precisely these strata of the working people that the ultra-leftists also assign a role as the moving force in revolutionary transformations, setting them in opposition to the skilled detachments of the working class, who are employed in the modern branches of the economy.

pa.

The problem of relations among the various detachments of the proletariat, their place in production and their role in the class struggle has great theoretical and political significance, and it presents the region's communist parties with new tasks in the work of converting the proletariat into a genuinely revolutionary class. By themselves the historical preconditions cannot raise the proletariat to the role of hegemon and leader of a broad social coalition. In this regard much depends on the concrete-historical conditions of struggle, on the alignment of forces, and mainly, on the ability and skill of the revolutionaries to make maximum use of all favorable opportunities on to the path to the proletariat's conversion into the hegemonic class, having eliminated or at least neutralized the negative factors along this path. The importance of the tasks of the class struggle is growing especially today, when Latin America is witnessing the unleashing of sharp opposition between the revolutionary and counterrevolutionary alternatives and a heightened struggle between the forces of democracy and the fascist reaction.

In the most developed countries--Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Mexico, Colombia and Venezuela--the class struggle constitutes the foundation of the developing anti-imperialist movement. The anti-imperialism of the proletariat is linked very closely to the struggle for class interests. In those countries which are in the vanguard of the liberation movement, the proletariat participates actively in anti-imperialist and social-economic transformations, which open up prospects for non-capitalist development.

The victory of the Cuban revolution, which exerted an enormous influence on the struggle of the working people, has contributed to the further growth of the proletariat's class consciousness and its willingness to fight. The proletariat made a decisive contribution to the revolutionary transformations in Peru (1968-1975), in Chile (up to September 1973), in Panama and a number of other Latin American countries. In Nicaragua the proletariat is determining the development of the revolutionary process and helping the country to move onto the rails of genuine economic and political independence. The alliance of the working class and the peasantry, in which the leading role belongs to the working class, is viewed by the leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front as a guarantee of the nonreversibility of the revolutionary gains.

As is well known, the Latin American proletariat has rich historical traditions of class struggle, including an active strike struggle, traditions which have their roots in the 19th century. The working class has inscribed many glorious pages in the history of the anti-imperialist democratic movement of the Latin American peoples. The role which strikes play today has grown especially large. This proletarian form of struggle has begun to be utilized by white-collar workers and many other segments of the urban middle strata. Despite all the unevenness in the development of the strike movement, its general tendency in the 70's was toward steady growth in the number of strikers (160 to 170 million people participated in strikes in Latin America in the years 1970-1980).

On the threshold of the 80's the workers movement in Latin America entered a new stage. The events of recent years obviously provide evidence that the present phase of the anti-imperialist revolutionary processes are linked in the closest possible manner to the struggle for the democratic transformation of the social structure. In countries with authoritarian and terrorist regimes (Chile, Paraguay and others) the tasks of overthrowing the dictatorship and of simultaneously satisfying democratic demands are beginning to take top priority. In countries with a constitutional form of rule (Venezuela, Colombia, Mexico, Peru and others) the tasks of deepening and expanding democracy are being posed. The struggle for democracy under present-day conditions here means not simply the defense of existing bourgeois-democratic institutions; it is rather the struggle against local and foreign monopolies--the main carriers of antidemocratic tendencies in all areas of social and political life. At the same time the working class, headed by its political vanguard, acts as the main factor in closing the ranks of the democratic forces. As shown by the experience of various countries, Brazil for example, the proletariat is currently striving for a profound and constructive dialog with all democratic forces in the name of the joint development of the strategy and tactics of the struggle for democracy.

The struggle for democracy in Latin America is a complex process. More and more new strata of the population are being drawn into it, as are political parties and revolutionary-democratic movements, which make a weighty contribution to the struggle against dictatorial and tyrannical regimes. A striking example of this can be seen in Nicaragua, where the SNLF has convincingly shown in practice that the revolutionary vanguard--by means of a flexible and well thought out strategy and tactics--can gain the role of hegemon and carry with it the broad masses of the population. The fact that a number of countries have seen the emergence of regimes with a progressive, anti-imperialist orientation, which have started to make profound social transformations, testifies to the new potentials of the revolutionary movement in Latin America.

The present period is characterized by the intensification of the liberation and anti-imperialist processes in the region, as well as by the acuteness of the class battles. The thrust of the Latin American proletariat's struggle is aimed with increasing frequency directly against the policy of the pro-imperialist ruling circles and their allies, against the military-dictatorships which they have imposed, i.e., the struggle against imperialism is becoming a form of class struggle. It is typical that as a rule working class demands have dominated in a majority of the anti-imperialist concepts.

The peasantry acts as an important ally of the working class in the liberation anti-imperialist struggle. The proletarianization and marginalization of the peasants in the late 70's and 80's has been accompanied at the same time by an increase in the number of those who own small and very small holdings. This is related to the splitting of peasant farms and to the policy of the ruling circles aimed at the broad utilization of cheap manpower of the semipeasant-semiproletarians. Typically there has been an outflow of formerly rural migrants from the city back to the country as a result of urban unemployment, which has grown sharply under the conditions of acute crisis.



The urban middle strata, which include approximately 19-20 million people, are acquiring ever increasing weight in the structure of Latin American society. This is the scientific and technical intelligentsia, various categories of white-collar workers, students, etc. The persistent tendency toward growth in their numbers compensates to a certain degree for the erosion of the traditional groups constituting the urban petty bourgeoisie. The intensifying differentiation within the middle strata, which is being increased by the process of proletarianization, helps to bring the working class closer to the hired groups of the middle strata. This process finds reflection in the radicalization of the political sentiments of these groups, which are acting with increasing frequency as one of the main moving forces in the democratic and anti-imperialist struggle. It is for precisely this reason that they have become an object of concentrated attention from the various political parties and organizations, and more recently from international and local social-democracy, which is attempting to include them in its social base.

The numerous marginal or semiproletarian strata of the population, which are still far from being organically integrated into the present-day capitalist production structure, have become an integral part of the structure of the Latin American city. Because of the specific features of their socio-economic position, they are the least stable politically; however, in a situation with acutely exacerbated class and social contradictions, their participation in the struggle on the side of the anti-imperialist forces has grown noticeably.

The broadest strata of the population, including the patriotically-inclined military and progressive church circles, are being drawn into the revolutionary struggle. All this raises the potential of the anti-imperialist movement, opens up new prospects for the intensification of its goals and tasks. There is specific evidence of this in the desire, which is increasing among practically all the revolutionary and democratic forces, to achieve unity on the basis of a program of profound anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchical transformations.

In the new historical situation, in which the proletariat has become an influential class of society and the inclusion in the struggle of the broad strata of the population has created favorable conditions for the advancement of the working class into the vanguard of the entire anti-imperialist liberation movement, the development of the revolutionary processes in Latin America, as well as their scale and speed, in no small degree depend on the communists' ability to carry the masses with them, on their skill in educating the masses using their own experience of the struggle. The growth in the influence of the communist parties, which participate actively in the struggle against imperialism, the struggle for a revolutionary solution to the crisis and for the implementation of fundamental social-economic and political transformations in the interests of the broad working masses, is an important historical achievement of the entire liberation movement in Latin America, a factor in social development and an important guiding tendency of the revolutionary process and one which is capable of reacting rapidly to a change in the political situation, and of actively influencing the resolution of the



problem of how to increase the unity of the democratic and anti-imperialist forces.

### In the Vanguard of the Revolutionary Struggle

The specific features in the development of the revolutionary process in the region are reflected theoretically in the programs of the Latin American communist parties; a majority of these programs were adopted in the 60's and 70's and clarified at subsequent congresses and plenums. On the basis of a thorough socio-economic analysis the communists have come to the conclusion that the formation of the local monopolistic bourgeoisie and financial-industrial oligarchy, the close interweaving of their interests with those of international foreign capital and the conversion of the latter into a unique component of deformed capitalist relations is the result of development along the capitalist path under conditions of dependence. For this reason the programs emphasize that a blow can be inflicted against the imperialism's positions only as part of the process of consistent class struggle, i.e., by means of a revolution aimed at the implementation of profound social-economic transformations, which undermine the positions of the local upper-bourgeois and land-owning factions.

In this regard the Mexican communists have pointed out that the "new revolution is aimed at the struggle against this deformation, against the monopolies and against major capitalist property in land. This constitutes its popular-democratic and anti-oligarchical nature because it goes farther than bourgeois and bourgeois-democratic revolutions of the past. These features give it a certain anti-imperialist nature. In terms of the type of state which is being created the new revolution will go beyond the limits of bourgeois democracy and will pave the way for the transition to a socialist democracy. The new revolution with its economic transformations will weaken the bases of capitalism and create the material conditions for the transition to socialism." (1) Imperialism has become the main brake on further development, and the achievement of the final goal--socialist revolution and the building of a socialist and subsequently a communist society--the Program of the Argentine Communist Party notes, can be accomplished only after the tasks of the anti-imperialist liberation revolution have been completed.

The communists have worked out a scientific strategy for the revolution. The most important task related to its successful implementation is the unification of the working people and of all progressive forces into broad anti-imperialist blocs and coalitions capable of achieving the implementation of profound democratic transformations with the further prospect of society's movement toward socialism. The vanguard role of the working class at the first--anti-imperialist and democratic--stage is called upon to give the struggle greater social content, which also makes it possible to conclude that the goals of the liberation anti-imperialist struggle are closely interwoven with the tasks of the struggle for the fundamental reorganization of society in the Latin American countries and that the two stages of the revolution are coming closer together. (2)

In the new political situation the communists face with greater urgency than before the task of generalizing the accumulated experience of revolutionary struggle in the region and of clarifying and improving their program statements in accordance with the true alignment of external and internal forces. Despite the diversity of the region's political conditions, which make it necessary for the communist parties to take a differentiated approach to the evaluation of the revolutionary forces in individual countries, the general characteristic of the current stage is considered by the communists to be the mobilization and the unification of broad social forces and political organizations in the struggle for democracy and social progress, and against the policy of U.S. imperialism, which is aimed at increasing the financial-economic dependency of the Latin American states and at imposing reactionary pro-imperialist regimes.

The communist parties of Latin America are faithful to the principles of Marxism-Leninism in their efforts to work out scientifically-based strategy and tactics, which take specific conditions into account and are also based on the experience accumulated by the revolutionary movement in other regions. The communist parties provide a decisive rebuff to both the right-wing opportunistic elements, who claim that the thrust of the struggle should be directed only against imperialism and who appeal for "class peace," as well as to the ultraleftist elements, who separate the liberation movement from the class struggle of the proletariat, who deny the role of the working class and who set the Latin American countries against the world system of socialism and the international workers movement.

In the present historical situation it is becoming more and more obvious that the direction of the liberation movement of the region's peoples coincides with the general orientation of the world revolutionary process toward socialism. Based on the experience of Cuba, Chile and Nicaragua, the communist parties, as well as many revolutionary-democratic organizations, are putting forward and substantiating the position that under the crisis conditions, which have grown sharply worse in the 80's, no one leftist political party or organization is in a position to provide--solely through its own efforts--a way out of this crisis and to successfully implement fundamental social-economic and political transformations. In order to implement the goals of a democratic, anti-imperialist revolution and to establish "revolutionary-democratic anti-imperialist people's power," most communist parties think that it is necessary to achieve a firm association of the leftist forces and to use it as the basis to form a united front, which includes all the national progressive political currents. The creation of broad fronts, as noted in the program documents of many of the region's communist parties, is the primary political condition for the resolution of the main strategic task, which is the unification of the working people and of all leftist forces and progressive currents around the working class for the successful transition to a democratic structure. In Latin America this first stage of the revolution, the communists think, is linked in the closest possible manner with the socialist stage.

When the Brazilian communists, for example, described the struggle during the transitional stage from the military dictatorship to civilian rule as anti-

imperialist, antimonopolistic and antifeudal, they came out in favor of creating a national bloc of all the democratic patriotic forces. Such a bloc, "the axis of which must be the working class," it was noted in the political resolution of the National Meeting of Communists (January 1984) entitled A "Democratic Alternative to Crisis," would ensure the irreversibility of the democratic process and open up the path to socialism. (3) A majority of the region's communist parties, like the Brazilian communists, view the formation of united fronts as the main strategic task. The policy of creating broad class and political alliances is viewed by the communists as the most important means of struggle to reach the masses and to raise the level of their consciousness.

In Uruguay, where they have a wealth of experience in the struggle of the masses against a dictatorship and for the democratization of the political regime, the communists--within the framework of the Broad Front--pose the task of uniting all the patriotic, democratic and anti-imperialist forces on the basis of working class solidarity. While viewing this process as a stage for the accumulation of forces, the communists note that the struggle for the broad unity of the people is a form of class struggle and in the course of it not only will immediate tasks be resolved but the goals of intensifying the process of democratization in the country and of achieving "advanced democracy" will also be pursued. (4)

Participating with the communists in the movement for the formation of the democratic anti-imperialist fronts are the socialists, christian democrats, leftist radicals and representatives of other political parties and organizations. The communists think that the achievement of unity among the leftist forces is the most important basis for the formation of a united front, which includes all the progressive currents. The communists note that under conditions in which the desire to become aware of new processes is increasing among various strata of the population and, as a result, the attraction of Marxism is growing, revolutionary democracy is shifting with increasing frequency to positions of scientific socialism, the positions of the communist parties and the leftist organizations are coming closer together, and an objective basis for their cooperation and the consolidation of their unity is developing. (5)

At the same time the Latin American communists consistently oppose the tendency among certain socialists and revolutionary democrats to limit cooperation to the leftist forces alone. The communists emphasize that this kind of approach narrows the opportunities for a united front. As R. Arismendi, general secretary of the Uruguayan Communist Party Central Committee noted, "the concept of a purely revolutionary front," in the event this concept is realized, makes it impossible to resolve the task of creating a revolutionary majority, which is the main condition for the formation of the social and political army of the revolution." (6)

In order to achieve the goals of unity among the democratic forces the communists utilize the most diverse forms and methods of struggle, proceeding from the social-economic and political situation which is developing at any given time in their countries and throughout the region, and taking into



account the degree of consciousness among the masses and other factors. In many states, especially those with constitutional regimes (Venezuela, Colombia, Mexico, Ecuador and in recent years Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay), which have growing national movements for profound reforms, the communists are making broad use of legal opportunities, and the parliamentary form of struggle in particular.

The active recruitment of the broad masses to participation in election campaigns as part of the leftist blocs makes it possible to narrow the social base of the reaction and to prevent the latter from using for its own interests the masses, who have become disillusioned with the reformist policies of the bourgeois governments. In places where there are bourgeois reformist regimes the parliamentary and municipal activities of the communists aimed at attacking the power of capital make it possible for them not only to put forward their initiatives and demands in the interests of the working class and of all democratic circles, but also to draw the masses into the struggle for genuine democratic, revolutionary transformations.

In a majority of the Central American and Caribbean countries, where the struggle is taking place in an extremely tense political atmosphere given U.S. intervention and interference, repression and persecution, as well as the fanning of anti-communist propaganda, a policy of utilizing armed forms of struggle predominates in the milieu of the democratic and leftist forces. They are overcoming substantial difficulties as they move toward the creation of very broad antidictatorial, general democratic coalitions, seeing in them the basis for unleashing democratic processes and the preconditions for the overthrow of dictatorships.

The communists direct their efforts toward ensuring that unity among the leftists is firm and that it has as its future goal the revolutionary transformation of society and the construction of socialism. They consider that the natural ideological and political disagreements on a number of questions should not and cannot serve as the basis for setting some forces against others, or for creating ideological splits and confrontations. While the communists join coalitions, at the same time they show particular concern for the preservation of the political and especially the ideological independence of all parties; they carry out a constant struggle against reformism, ultraleftism, and the identification of ultra-left concepts with "true" Marxism-Leninism.

In the present international situation, given the further intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, the exacerbation of the political struggle, and the sharp increase of tension in Central America and the Caribbean as a result of the increased U.S. aggressiveness, the problem of the anti-imperialist forces closing ranks around the working class acquires particularly great significance. This unification takes place not only during the struggle for the socio-economic and political demands of the working people, but also during the growth process of the movement for democratization of international economic relations, for solidarity with the liberation struggle of the region's peoples and other countries of the world against the threat of nuclear war and for disarmament.



The current strategy and tactics of the Latin American communist parties are being developed with consideration for the analysis of the complex specific features and diversity of forms of the liberation process in the region, which make it necessary for the communist parties to take a differentiated approach to evaluating the opportunities of the revolutionary forces in the various Latin American states. However, as the communists point out, the general and generating basis and core of the liberation process is the struggle for democracy and social progress, the struggle against U.S. imperialism and the imposition of rightist authoritarian and dictatorial regimes on the countries in the region. This struggle is conducted in various forms, with varying degrees of depth, intensity and acuteness, but it shows a single tendency: in the course of this struggle the real preconditions are being created for profound democratic and anti-imperialist transformations of the social order, which open up prospects for socialism. Its inextricable link with the worldwide struggle between the forces of social progress and reaction and between labor and capital is manifesting itself with ever greater clarity and distinctness. Herein lies the pledge of coming victories and successes for the liberation processes which are developing on the Latin American continent.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. LA VOZ DE MEXICO. Mexico, 25 June 1967.
2. "Mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye. Voprosy istorii i teorii" [The International Workers Movement. Questions of History and Theory], Vol 7, Moscow, 1985, p 477.
3. "Uma alternativa democratica para a crisis brasileira." Sao Paulo, 1985.
4. LA HORA. Montevideo, 23 May 1985; PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, No 3, 1984, p 78.
5. "Informe del Comit  Central al XIX Congreso Nacional de PCM." Mexico, 1981.
6. OPOSICION. Mexico, 18 January 1980.
7. ALAI. Montreal, 3 February 1984; PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, No 4, 1983, p 10.
8. "Informe del Comit  Central al XIX Congreso Nacional del PCM."
9. "Congreso Nacional del PCM." Mexico, 1981.
10. VOZ PROLETARIA. Bogota, 4 August 1985.
11. BOLETIN DEL EXTERIOR. S. 1, No 71, 1985, pp 17, 35, 41.
12. PRAVDA, 31 October 1985; BOLETIN DEL EXTERIOR, No 70, 1985, p 5.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1986

8543

CSO: 1807/267

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### INCREASING LATIN AMERICAN ACTIVITY IN WORLD AFFAIRS NOTED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 86 pp 47-58

[Article by A.N. Glinkin: "Latin American in 20th Century International Relations"]

[Excerpts] The development of the world revolutionary process exerts a transforming effect on the entire system of international relations which have developed on the basis of the patterns and principles of capitalism described by V.I. Lenin as "naked plunder of the weak." (1) The increased might and influence in world affairs of the Soviet Union and the alliance of the socialist states is the main moving factor in the re-organization of international relations on a democratic, peace-loving foundation.

Another important aspect of this process is that world politics have ceased to be the monopoly of a few powers, which have traditionally have been called "great." An ever larger number of countries, which were colonies or semi-colonies either recently or in the more distant historical past, have become active participants in international relations. "One of the realities of today's world," noted M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is the emergence in the world arena of dozens of states from Asia, Africa and Latin America which are striving to overcome the pernicious consequences of colonialism. The overwhelming majority of them adhere to a policy of nonalignment. The emergence of the Nonaligned Movement and its transformation into an important factor in world politics is a natural phenomenon of the present day. It is an obvious reflection of the aspiration of the liberated peoples for cooperation among states based on equal rights, for recognition by others of their legitimate rights and interests, for the exclusion from international life of any manifestations of dominance and diktat or claims to hegemony." (2)

With each passing year the Soviet Union's relations with the developing countries are becoming ever broader and more versatile. The struggle of the USSR and of all peace-loving forces for the prevention of thermonuclear catastrophe and the confirmation of a firm peace on Earth meets with growing understanding and support from many of these states. For this reason the study of the economic, political, social and ideological factors which determine their behavior in the world arena and research into the specific

facts of their historical experience, which is reflected in their foreign policy activity, their diplomacy and their foreign policy doctrines and concepts, today acquire not only academic but also practical interest.

In the course of the 20th century important changes have taken place in the foreign policy activities of the Latin American and Caribbean countries. The essence of these changes lies in the fact that Latin America has ceased to be primarily an object of world politics, which was a determining feature of its development at the beginning of this century. The "closed nature" of the region's countries within the Procrustean bed of the inter-American system, which was preserved for many decades, has receded irrevocably into the past, as have their significant isolation from the main events of international life and their subordination to the "bloc diplomacy" of the USA. The role of the region's states in international relations is growing with every decade. The changes which have taken place are so substantial that they already go beyond national or regional limits, exerting a growing influence on the general situation in the present-day world.

In our time Latin America has become a zone in which the basic contradictions of capitalism are manifested with particular intensity. Its peoples have had to conduct a liberation struggle under difficult conditions, in direct proximity to the main center of imperialism, which continues to view the region as a sphere of its traditional economic, political and military-strategic dominance. At the same time socialist Cuba is already developing, and a revolutionary-democratic state has arisen in Nicaragua, which sets itself the goal of building a new society free of exploitation and oppression. The anti-imperialist movements and anticapitalist statements of the Latin American and Caribbean peoples have come to occupy a significant place in the world revolutionary process, and in the struggle against neocolonialism, the struggle for a new place for the continent within the system of the global division of labor, in international relations. Despite the fact that the processes which are being unleashed in the region are complex and not identical, and indeed often extremely contradictory, the position which the Latin American countries in general take on the key problems of the present, especially on the questions of war and peace, contributes to the development of positive tendencies in the international relations.

An important factor in increasing the weight of the Latin American countries in world politics is the diversification of the foreign ties maintained by the region's states; this is an important indicator of their active participation in international life. Upon entering the 20th century, the Latin American states had extremely limited foreign-political and foreign-economic ties, which were primarily oriented toward the USA and a number of Western European countries. In 1900, for example, only four Latin American countries out of 19 (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Uruguay) maintained diplomatic relations with Russia. Intra-regional relations were also poorly developed, although the Latin American countries were brought together by a common historical destiny and identical economic interests, as well as linguistic and cultural kinship. It is not surprising that at the start of the 20th century Mexico, for example, had 13 diplomatic missions, including two in Latin America; Argentina had 12 and Colombia had eight. (9) In the first five years following the

achievement of independence (1902-1907) Cuba established diplomatic relations with the USA, China, five Latin American and six European states. At this time it had only two missions in Western Europe (London and Paris), which represented its interests in other European capitals. (10)

At the present time a large group of Latin American states, actively participates in international life and has a developed and diversified system of external ties, maintaining relations and cooperating in economic and political areas with states on all five continents. For example, in the early 80's Brazil maintained diplomatic relations with more than 90 states and Cuba with 120. (11) Argentina, Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and Peru have foreign political partners which approach or exceed 100 in number. As Luis Echeverria, the former president of Mexico correctly emphasizes, "expanding the system of our relations with the external world means strengthening Mexico's positions and implementing the principles of cooperation which we espouse." (12)

An important parameter of growth in the international influence of the Latin American countries is their participation in the Nonaligned Movement, which plays an important role in current world politics and reflects the aspiration of the liberated states to get away from the political system of imperialism, to carry out an independent foreign policy and to coordinate their activities on an international level. In the quarter of a century which has passed since the first Conference of the Heads of States and Governments of the Nonaligned Countries, which was held in 1961, the overwhelming majority of the independent states of Latin America and the Caribbean has entered the ranks of this movement or taken up a position of constructive cooperation with them, while maintaining observer status.

The substantial change in the place and role of the Latin American countries in world politics is related to an objective historical process in the development of their productive forces, to shifts in the socio-class structure, to growth in the nationalist tendencies in the ruling forces' bloc, and to the increase in the influence of the working masses and their organizations on the formation of foreign policy. It is instructive that the processes of democratic renewal in 1983-1985 in the southern cone countries (Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay), where military rule was replaced by civilian governments, prompted a significant activization of their diplomacy. The positive results of the foreign policy activity of these governments during the short period following the crushing of the dictatorships can be seen in such actions as the restoration of Bolivia's and Uruguay's diplomatic relations with socialist Cuba; Argentina's statements made jointly with Mexico, Greece, India, Tanzania and Sweden in favor of a halt to the arms race and the prevention of the militarization of space, as well as Brazil's statements in support of the principles of self-determination of peoples, non-interference in internal affairs, the peaceful resolution of quarrels and the creation of a Latin American "Contadora support group."

The economic and social-political differentiation of the region's countries exerts a serious influence on the region's international ties. Certain states, which lead in terms of growth, accumulate the main results of economic and scientific-technical progress in Latin America. As a result, it is in



this milieu that one finds claimants to the role of regional power centers striving to create their own spheres of influence. The fact that under present-day conditions the importance of foreign policy as an instrument to mobilize resources for the goals of national development is growing has substantial significance.

All this gives rise to considerable differences in the foreign policy courses of various Latin American countries. At the same time their foreign policy activities are characterized by instability: frequently there are temporary deviations and defeats in a generally positive balance, while the shifts which are basically progressive sometimes have their shady sides as well.

The historical evolution of the role of the Latin American countries in international relations during the 20th century has been characterized by a number of features. In the first place, the rate of positive changes in their foreign policy activities has grown with each passing decade. During the first two decades of the 20th century, a tendency toward a sharp increase in dependence on imperialism predominated; in the period between the two world wars the region's states, with the exception of Mexico and sometimes Argentina, did not succeed in breaking through the limiting barriers of the inter-American system. But after the rout of the shock detachment of world reaction--German fascism and Japanese militarism--the system of imperialist "guardianship" of the foreign policy ties of the Latin American countries began to break up. The formation of the world system of socialism and the victory of the Cuban revolution provided a powerful impulse for the re-organization of international relations in the region, and they made the tendency toward an increase in Latin America's weight in world politics irreversible. This was also confirmed by the victory of the Sandinista revolution.

In the second place, the content of their foreign-policy activities changed. For a long time they were primarily passive and local in nature, representing a direct reaction to the threats arising from the imperialist powers, or to the actions of neighboring countries. With the changing alignment of forces in favor of the peoples fighting for social progress, democracy, national freedom and peace, the foreign policy of a large group of the region's countries has become active in nature. A number of new directions in foreign policy activity began to determine its image: specifically, ties with the world of socialism; cooperation with the Afro-Asian countries; participation in the Nonaligned Movement; the policy of the UN and other international organizations; and participation in the work to resolve the problems of ensuring peace and security.

As a result, the number of Latin American countries speaking from independent positions in the world arena has grown. Moreover, the flexible and diversified system of organs and organizations for international cooperation which they created in the 60's and 70's without U.S. participation provides opportunities for the coordination of their joint statements on a number of important international questions. In other words, these states have developed collective forms to struggle for their rights in the world arena.

In the tenser international atmosphere of the 80's their significance for the Latin American countries has grown. The idea of holding a "summit meeting," which was put forward by Peru's president, Alan Garcia, and Panama's president, Eric del Valle, is gaining more and more adherents. Argentina, Brazil, Cuba and Ecuador have come out in favor of calling such a meeting; they supported E. Del Valle's proposal to hold a summit meeting in Panama in mid-1986, which marks the 160th anniversary of the first international congress of the region's countries, which was held on Panamanian soil in 1826 at the initiative of Simon Bolivar. In December 1985, after consultations between the governments of Panama and Peru, a preliminary agenda was announced which included five basic questions: foreign debt, the status of international trade, support for the efforts of the "Contadora group" on the peaceful settlement of the conflict situation in Central America, arms control, as well as control over the underground narcotics trade. (13) Thus, the summit plans call for the discussion of a broad range of the region's current problems and the development of a general approach to them, which is a very important condition for the achievement of progress in their resolution.

The positive experience accumulated in the performance of successful joint actions, as well as the real demands for the defense of common interests related primarily to the struggle for change in Latin America's unequal position in the world capitalist system, will continue to cement Latin American unity, which is developing under conditions of acute ideological and political struggle between the supporters and opponents of genuine independence and a sovereign foreign-policy course for the Latin American countries.

When examining a) the positive changes in the foreign policy of a large group of Latin American countries and b) the further establishment of components in that policy which have an objectively anti-imperialist tendency, one must not fail to note that the formation and realization of their foreign-policy courses are influenced not only by the internal laws of the development of the Latin American societies, but also by those fundamental changes in the world arena which are characterized by the growing role of the USSR and the entire socialist alliance.

Within the framework of the system of ties between the socialist states and Latin America, which has developed in the post-war period, and which is resistant to pressure from external forces, relations of a new type, which is determined by the laws of socialism and not imperialism, are becoming established. Its political significance for the Latin American countries is measured by the fact that world socialism and the CPSU decisively favor the "participation by the liberated countries with full rights in international affairs, and an increase in their contribution to the resolution of the most important problems of the present day." (14)

Cuba--the advance post of socialism in the Western hemisphere--has acquired great international prestige. It is making enormous efforts to close ranks with the Latin American and Caribbean countries in the interests of the joint struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism. The fraternal cooperation which has been established between revolutionary Nicaragua and

Cuba; the friendly relations with Guyana; broader contacts with Surinam, which has started down the path of democratic transformations--all these and other facts testify to the fact that socialist Cuba serves as the center of attraction for those governments and countries in the region which have chosen a path of independent development. U.S. imperialism fiercely opposes this progressive tendency, which appeared at the threshold of the 80's. However, it is making itself known and beyond it lies the future.

The historical opposition of the peoples and countries of Latin America to imperialism, and especially to North American imperialism, is marked by new features at the present stage.

As a result of the neocolonialist strategy which is being implemented by the multinational corporations, the dependence of the region's countries on the centers of modern imperialism is undergoing a complex evolution characterized by the appearance and development of new forms of dependence: technological dependence, food dependence and especially currency-financial dependence. Further, the preservation and even expansion of foreign control over the economy, the increase in the scale on which the MNC's carry out their plunder of the region, Washington's attempts to shift onto neighboring countries the burden of expenditures for the irrational arms race, and the imperialist policy of diktat and interventionism--all this leads to a constant multiplication and exacerbation of the contradictions between U.S. imperialism and Latin America. The system of imperialist oppression has proved to be a in a state of profound crisis as a result of the powerful upswing in the people's struggle against the MNC's and the development models imposed by them, the struggle for the affirmation of the sovereign right to dispose of their own resources, for the establishment of the new international economic order, and for salvation from the excessive debt burden. In sum, American imperialism's opportunities to influence the foreign policy of its southern neighbors in the direction necessary for itself are being reduced substantially. This is caused both by the successes of the anti-imperialist movement as well as by the strengthening of the international positions of the region's states thanks to the development of relations--which are not under imperialism's control--with the world of socialism and the Afro-Asian countries, and to their participation in the Nonaligned Movement.

The concrete manifestations of this pattern are obvious when one compares the current position with that which existed even a few decades ago, when many reactionary governments in the region obediently followed the lead of U.S. policy. For example, in the first postwar years the U.S. ruling circles, having unleashed the "cold war," succeeded in unifying the foreign policy of all the Latin American states (with the exception of Mexico and Argentina) on the basis of anticommunism, and in using them for the purpose of creating its own "voting machine" in the UN. Nor were the region's countries (except Mexico) able to avoid participating in the "collective sanctions" against socialist Cuba in the 60's.

Since the beginning of the 80's, when a new administration arrived in the White House, the attack on Latin America by international imperialism has grown more active. The actions of Great Britain in the South Atlantic should



also be viewed in this context. As a result, the tension in the situation throughout Latin America has increased. The Reagan administration has put forth a great deal of effort to gain support on a regional scale for its Caribbean strategy, but it has not been successful.

For the first time in the century-and-a-half history of relations between the USA and its southern neighbors, these countries have openly set their course--at the level of official foreign policy--in opposition to Washington's interventionist policy. They reject both the ideological postulates of the White House, which tries unsuccessfully to explain the development of revolutionary processes in the region by "Soviet-Cuban interference" and to interpret them as a manifestation of East-West confrontation; they also reject the U.S. imperialists' reliance on armed force, their utilization of the tactics of "undeclared war" against Nicaragua and subversive operations against inconvenient governments. The activities of the "Contadora group" and the unification of a number of South American states in support of its efforts reflect the aspiration of the region's peoples and governments to achieve a settlement of the conflict situation in Central America by peaceful political means and to defend the principles of noninterference and respect for the right of every people to manage its own fate according to its own judgment.

Regional conflicts present a serious danger, especially in the nuclear age. During the Geneva summit meeting between the leaders of the USSR and USA both sides expressed concern about "hot spots" in the developing world. However, their approaches to the reasons for the emergence of substantial regional conflicts and the methods for eliminating them are diametrically opposed. In Washington in the mid 80's, the concept of the "new globalism" has been put forward; it is designed to justify the intentional fanning of conflict foci and the expanding of interventionist actions by the White House in Asia, Africa and Latin America. And it is the USA which bears responsibility for the slowdown in the Contadora process, which is aimed at the normalization of the situation in Central America.

The Soviet Union decisively rejects the interpretation of all contradictions and conflicts, whether in Asia, Africa or Latin America, as being manifestations of global opposition between East and West. It consistently favors settling these conflicts around the negotiating table on the basis of respect for the rights of peoples to self-determination and independent development, and it supports constructive efforts in this direction. The USSR position meets with understanding from the international community, including Latin America.

Having dissociated itself from the global strategy of U.S. imperialism and its militaristic course in the region, the main group of the Latin American countries continues to favor the strengthening of the nuclear-free zone in Latin America, the restoration of the trampled rights of Argentina in the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands and the conduct of global negotiations for the new international economic order.

The Falklands (Malvinas) war and the U.S. intervention in Grenada shook Latin America. Its peoples became convinced with their own eyes that at any moment



the imperialists could bring down on their heads the entire might of modern weapons, including nuclear weapons. A shift took place in the public consciousness which added a new impulse to the anti-war movement in the region. The governments of a number of countries officially expressed themselves in favor of a halt to the arms race and the nonmilitarization of outer space; they emphasized once again in the "Caracas Declaration" (December 1985) that "development and the problem of peace are inextricably interrelated." (15) The Latin American states have increased the level of their UN activities when issues related to saving mankind from nuclear catastrophe are concerned.

An analysis of long-term trends thus provides evidence that the hopes of the U.S. imperialists to carry out a policy of social revanchism in this sector of world politics is not fated to come true. In today's world the role of the main group of Latin American countries continues to grow, although the worsening international situation and the increasing aggressiveness of U.S. policy have created many new and complex problems and obstacles to the implementation of a sovereign foreign policy course by the continent's states.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 20, p 245.
2. PRAVDA, 22 May 1985.
9. Calculated according to: Boletin oficial de la Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, Vol 12. Mexico, 1901, p 295-314; Memoria de relacion exteriores y culto 1898-1899. Buenos Aires, 1899, pp 453-473; Anales diplomaticos y consulares. 1900. Bogota. 1901, pp 12-53.
10. Calculated according to: Anuario diplomatico y consular de la Republica de Cuba 1925. La Habana, 1925, pp 213-219; C. de la Torriente. Cuba en la vida internacional, Vol 1. La Habana, 1922, p 26.
11. See E.A. Grinevich, B.I. Gvozdev. "Kuba v mirovoy politike" [Cuba in World Politics], Moscow, 1984, Appendix I.
12. EL MERCADO DE VALORES. Mexico, No 8, 1974, p 229.
13. GRANMA. La Habana, 18 December 1985.
14. PRAVDA, 26 October 1985.
15. GRANMA, 9 September 1985

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1986

8543

CSO: 1807/267

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### COURSE OF SOVIET-LATIN AMERICAN POLITICAL RELATIONS EXAMINED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 86 pp 88-92

[Article by A.I. Sizonenko: "USSR--Latin America: Political Ties"]

[Text] Political contacts traditionally are one of the most important means of intercourse among states and peoples. In combination with other forms of ties--economic, cultural and scientific--they have great significance for the development of international relations based on cooperation and mutual understanding. In our times political ties are one of the deciding factors which help in the achievement of consensus on the key problems of the present day and on questions of bilateral relations.

Since the very beginning of its existence the Country of the Soviets has favored the establishment of these ties with other states and peoples, including those in Latin America. The Peace Decree, adopted by the 2d Congress of the Soviets on 8 November 1917, was the first foreign policy document of this kind. It talked about "distant countries overseas," (1) which applied directly to Latin America as well.

Because the conditions necessary for the development of mutual trade were lacking, the experience of Soviet-Latin American contacts in 1917-1927 (before the emergence of Yuzhamtorg) naturally put top priority during this period on ties of a political nature. This was dictated as well by the USSR's struggle for its own international-legal recognition, which was a struggle against the hostile imperialist encirclement. Many examples can be cited of political dialog between the Soviet state and the Latin American countries during this period, especially with Mexico; this was to no small degree related to the anti-imperialist nature of the bourgeois democratic revolution of 1910-1917 and the broad sympathies of the working masses in that country for Soviet Russia. The 1919 meeting between M.M. Borodin, the first RSFSR consul in Mexico, and President V. Carransa; the contacts between the RSFSR NKID (People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs) and Mexico's general consulate in Moscow; the 1922 talks between D.Dubrovskiy, a representative of the Russian Red Cross in America, and President A. Obregon on the subject of aid for the people starving in the Volga region; as well as a whole range of other factors testified to the significance which both countries attributed to the dialog with each other. In October 1922 G.V. Chicherin said: "We must talk with

everyone and listen to everybody, we must be interested in the development of Mexico and the South American republics..." (2) This statement demonstrated the desire of the Soviet government as early as the first years of Soviet power to establish political dialog with a broad range of states, including those in Latin America. There is further evidence of this in the invitation to visit the Soviet Union which was made by the USSR government in September 1924 to the new president of Mexico, P. Callesa. (3)

Clear examples of political dialog in Soviet-Latin American relations are provided by the 1923-1926 talks about the establishment of diplomatic relations with Mexico and Uruguay; NKID contacts with a number of other Latin American countries; the actual work of the first USSR plenipotentiaries in Mexico, S.S. Peskovskiy and A.M. Kollontay; and finally the joint work of the USSR and the Latin American countries on the Preparatory Committee for a Disarmament Conference.

Some time later, in the League of Nations, these ties yielded productive results: the USSR and Mexico proved to have the same approach on the issues of aid to republican Spain and in the condemnation of the Munich agreement. (4) At the same time it was discovered that the USSR and Colombia held similar views. The Soviet historian E.E. Litavrina points out that "the Program of International Cooperation put forward during the presidency of A. Lopez generally was in keeping with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which was aimed at creating a system of collective security and providing a joint rebuff to fascist aggression." (5)

During the Second World War political dialog in Soviet-Latin American relations expanded; this was expressed in the successful negotiations about the establishment of diplomatic relations, in messages which were exchanged by the heads of state of the USSR and the Latin American countries, in various meetings between Soviet and Latin American diplomats, and in the actual work of the first Soviet ambassadors to Latin America.

The experience of those already distant years has shown the mutual benefit of political contacts between the USSR and the Latin American countries, and it has contributed to the establishment of "bridges" between the two sides, to their mutual understanding and to the search for ways to further strengthen relations.

Since that time more than four decades have passed. Soviet-Latin American relations have undergone substantial changes; they are growing stronger and developing in the most diverse areas. In the post war period much that is new has emerged in these relations. The desire for the development of interstate political relations has been mutual in nature: it has come from the Soviet Union as well as from many Latin American countries, who have seen it as one way to expand their international ties and to strengthen their positions in the world arena. "The Soviet Union, noted R. Caldera, Venezuela's president in 1970, "plays an important role in the present-day world, and this significance prompts us to carry on a dialog and to resolve questions with that country without intermediaries." (6) Convincing evidence of the desire to carry on this kind of dialog can be seen in the diplomatic

relations which many Latin American countries established with the USSR after the victory of the Cuban revolution.

Summit meetings have the greatest significance for the development of interstate ties. The first Latin American head of state to make an official visit to the USSR (not counting the frequent visits to the Soviet Union of Fidel Castro, leader of socialist Cuba), was the president of Chile, Salvador Allende (1972). Since that time official visits have been made by the presidents of Mexico (twice) and Venezuela, the prime ministers of Guyana, Grenada and Jamaica, as well as delegations made up of government and party members from Nicaragua. The talks which they had with the Soviet leadership produced results: they ended with the signing of various kinds of agreements and contributed to the strengthening of reciprocal relations and mutual understanding on the questions discussed, which concerned both bilateral problems as well as the international situation. When J. Lopez Portillo, the president of Mexico, talked about his 1978 visit to the USSR, he emphasized in particular that it "signified a continuation of a valuable dialog started in that period when the peoples of our countries, with arms in their hands, had just completed revolutions and were conducting a struggle against the internal and external reaction." (7) This dialog, as well as other forms of political ties between Mexico and the USSR, which have already become traditional, yield positive results in the most varied areas of relations between both countries. The shared positions on the most important problems--the preservation of peace and the elimination of the threat of nuclear war--are especially significant here.

As a result of the summit negotiations quite a few agreements, protocols, and conventions encompassing various aspects of mutual cooperation have been signed. For example, during the visits to the USSR made by the Mexican presidents L. Echeverria and J. Lopez Portillo five documents of various kinds were signed. In addition, the USSR signed an additional protocol to the Agreement on the Banning of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (the Tlatelolco Treaty). During the visit of the Guyanan prime minister F. Burnham in 1978, three agreements were concluded. Seven documents on cooperation in various areas were signed during the March 1980 Moscow visit by a government-party delegation from Nicaragua. (8)

Since the late 50's Soviet statesmen have visited Latin America. For example, the first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, A.I. Mikoyan, visited Mexico in November 1959, in connection with the opening of the USSR Exhibition of Achievements in Science, Technology and Culture. His meeting with the president of the country, A. Lopez Mateos, took place at that time. In February 1960 he visited revolutionary Cuba and had talks with Fidel Castro, which ended with the signing of extremely significant documents.

A Soviet government delegation, headed by A.N. Kosygin, visited Argentina in 1960 in connection with the 150th anniversary of the May Revolution.

Since the late 60's Soviet-Latin American meetings have been held at the foreign ministerial level (as for socialist Cuba, these meetings became regular in nature soon after the victory of the Cuban revolution). The first



guest at this level from Latin America was the Mexican foreign minister A. Carrillo Flores (1968). He defined the basic aim of his visit in the following way: "to outline ways to develop friendship between our countries on the basis of mutual respect." (9) As the results of this and subsequent Soviet-Mexican meetings have shown, this task has been carried out. As Soviet-Latin American relations are stepped up and expanded, talks at the level of heads of government and states as well as at the foreign ministerial level have continued to develop and grow stronger.

In December 1985 the first visit to the USSR by a Brazilian foreign minister, O. Setubal, took place. In the course of talks recognition was given to the "special significance of political dialog and the wisdom of expanding bilateral exchange of opinions under present conditions..." (10)

One of the most important forms of inter-state ties at the present stage is the inter-parliamentary exchange. Its starting point was the 9 February 1955 Declaration of the USSR Supreme Soviet which emphasized that the establishment of direct ties between parliaments and an exchange of parliamentary delegations would meet the desires of peoples for the development of friendly relations and cooperation. (11)

The first delegation of parliamentarians, who visited the USSR in 1956, were from Brazil and Uruguay. Their visits and numerous meetings with the Soviet community had significant political resonance; they made it possible for the guests to learn about Soviet reality, and they helped to dissipate all kinds of hostile anti-Soviet insinuations. For example, in 1960 M. Figueroa, the leader of a Peruvian delegation, emphasized in one of his interviews that imperialist propaganda creates fabrications about the "iron curtain." (12)

In 1958 delegations from the USSR Supreme Soviet made their first visits to Latin America (Uruguay and Brazil). In general, from that year to the present, USSR Supreme Soviet delegations have made more than 30 official visits to various countries of Latin America, and in turn dozens of parliamentary delegations from Latin America have visited the Soviet Union.

For example, an April 1980 visit to Brazil by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, headed by E.A. Shevardnadze, was a major landmark in this area of inter-state contacts in recent years. It was the first trip by Soviet parliamentarians to Brazil since 1964. It provided an opportunity to improve the climate of Soviet-Brazilian relations and to find a way to further develop them. In Brazil the results of the delegation's visit prompted a broad response. The influential newspaper ESTADO DE SAN-PAULO stated that "ideological obstacles must not interfere with the strengthening of our relations with the Soviet Union." (13) The CORREIO BRASILIENSE, which is close to government circles, emphasized that "the gradual rapprochement of two countries must bring mutual benefit not only in the international arena but also in trade...Now, at a time when Brazil is rejecting a policy of automatic alliance with Washington...a closer rapprochement with Moscow is required." (14) With regard to a visit by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, Deputy A. Bezerra noted at a session of Brazil's National Congress that in their

struggle the peoples of the developing countries find support from the USSR.  
(15)

New forms have been added to the traditional forms of Soviet-Latin American political ties. In a 1973 joint Soviet-Mexican communique about the visit to the USSR by the Mexican president L. Echeverria, the parties expressed a willingness to carry out periodic consultations on issues of mutual interest. (16) In this way the system of political relations between the USSR and the Latin American countries was supplemented by one more useful and important link. At the present time the practice of bilateral consultations is a continuously active factor in the Soviet Union's relations with many of the region's countries. The meetings held before the start of regular UN General Assembly sessions by the leader of the Soviet delegation with the foreign affairs ministers of the Latin American countries have also become regular in nature.

Statements by the Soviet government and TASS made in connection with any given important events taking place in Latin America are also of great significance. For example, the Soviet Union decisively condemned American aggression against the Dominican Republic and Grenada, the overthrow of the legitimate government of S. Allende and the military actions unleashed by England in connection with the Malvinas crisis. The USSR has frequently spoken out against Washington's interference in Nicaraguan affairs. At the Soviet-American exchange of opinions which took place in Washington in late October and early November 1985 concerning the situation in Central America the Soviet side emphasized the need to achieve a peaceful settlement on the basis of strict respect for the sovereignty of states and non-interference in their internal affairs.

The results of UN votes are one of the indicators that the political approach of the Soviet Union and that of many Latin American countries are moving closer together with regard to the acute problems of the present day, which concern all mankind. For example, at the 40th session of the General Assembly the Latin American states joined with the USSR in voting for the prevention of the arms race in space, for an immediate halt to and ban on the testing of nuclear weapons (17), and for a whole range of other proposals.

Also in the 70's and 80's, trips by USSR government delegations to attend the ceremonies at which power was transferred to the new heads of states and governments of Latin America became a firmly established practice. During these visits meetings take place between the heads of the Soviet delegations and the new leaders of these countries, and questions related to the development of bilateral relations are discussed.

In recent years an exchange of messages between political and other public figures and organizations on acute international questions has acquired great significance. A joint message by the heads of six states which participated in the Delhi Declaration, including the presidents of Argentina and Mexico, to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, prompted a great response. It expressed a hope for positive changes in international relations as a result of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. In his

P.O. Yakovlev, O.N. Zhirnov, A.V. Gorokhov. "Latinskaya Amerika: problemy vooruzheniy i razoruzheniya" [Latin America: Problems of Arms and Disarmament]. "Nauka", 1982, 134 pages.

#### HISTORICAL SCIENCES

"Podvig Simona Bolivara" [The Heroic Deeds of Simon Bolivar]. Yu.A. Zubritskiy, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1982, 126 pages.

"Simon Bolivar: istoriya i sovremennost" [Simon Bolivar: History and the Present]. A.F. Shulgovskiy, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1985, 296 pages.

#### THE STUDY OF LATIN AMERICAN PROBLEMS

"Institut Latinskoy Ameriki AN SSSR" [The Institute of Latin America of the USSR Academy of Sciences]. ILA, 1982, 11 pages.

"Latinoamerikanistika v SShA, stranakh Zapadnoy Evropy i Yaponii" [Latin American Studies in the USA, the Western European Countries and Japan]. A.S. Kovalskaya, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1982, 147 pages.

"Latinskaya Amerika: Bolivar i sovremennost" [Latin America: Bolivar and the Present]. Conference Theses. ILA, 1983, 37 pages.

"Sovetskaya latinoamerikanistika posle pobedy Kubinskoy revolyutsii" [Soviet Latin American Studies Since the Victory of the Cuban Revolution]. V.V. Volskiy, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1981, 378 pages.

"Sovremennyy etap osvoboditelnogo dvizheniya v Latinskoy Amerike i zadachi sovetskoy latinoamerikanistiki" [The Current Stage of the Liberation Movement in Latin America and the Tasks of Soviet Latin-American Studies]. Conference Theses. ILA, 1981, p 47.

"40 let istoricheskoy pobedy v Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyne i Latinskaya Amerika" [Latin America and Forty Years of the Historic Victory in the Great Patriotic War]. Conference Theses. ILA, 1985, 26 pages.

#### REFERENCE BOOKS

"Latinskaya Amerika. Entsiklopedicheskiy spravochnik (v 2-kh tomakh)" [Latin America. An Encyclopedic Handbook (in two volumes)]. V.V. Volskiy, main editor. Moscow, "Sovetskaya entsiklopediya", 1979-1982, Vol 1, 576 pages; Vol 2, 656 pages.

"Latinskaya Amerika v sovetskoy pechati" [Latin America in the Soviet Press]. K.A. Surova, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1981, 213 pages; 1984, 212 pages; 1985, 246 pages.

## WORKS ON INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

Z.I. Romanova. "Razvitiye kapitalizma v Argentine" [The Development of Capitalism in Argentina]. "Nauka", 1985, 287 pages.

"Rossiya, SSSR-Argentina: 100 let otnosheniy" [Russia, USSR-Argentina: 100 Years of Relations]. A.I. Sizonenko, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1985, 187 pages.

"Sotsialno-ekonomicheskaya struktura Argentiny: problemy i suzhdeniya" [The Socio-economic Structure of Argentina: Problems and Opinions], V.V. Volskiy, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1984, 277 pages.

"Braziliya: tendentsii ekonomicheskogo i sotsialno-politicheskogo razvitiya" [Brazil: Economic and Socio-political Development Trends]. V.V. Volskiy, editor-in-chief. "Nauka", 1983, 367 pages.

"Kultura Brazili" [The Culture of Brazil]. V.A. Kuzmishchev, editor-in-chief. "Nauka", 1981, 272 pages.

"Venesuela: tendentsii ekonomicheskogo i sotsialno-politicheskogo razvitiya" [Venezuela: Economic and Socio-political Development Trends]. Yu.A. Zubritskiy, editor-in-chief. "Nauka", 1984, 325 pages.

"Kultura Venesuely" [The Culture of Venezuela]. V.A. Kuzmishchev. editor-in-chief. "Nauka", 1984, 248 pages.

"SSSR-Colombiya: na printsipakh ravnopravnogo sotrudnichestva" [USSR-Colombia: Cooperation based on Principles of Equal Rights]. Yu.A. Zubritskiy, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1985, 94 pages.

"XXV let Kubinskoy revolyutsii" [Twenty-Five Years of the Cuban Revolution]. Conference Theses. A.D. Bekarevich, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1984, 210 pages.

"Kuba: stroitelstvo sotsializma. Ekonomicheskiye i sotsialno-politicheskiye aspekty. [Cuba: the Building of Socialism. Economic and Socio-political Aspects]. A.D. Bekarevich, editor-in-chief. "Nauka", 1983, 287 pages.

"Monkada: prichiny, dvizhushchiye sily i istoricheskoye znachenie" [The Moncada: Causes, Moving Forces and Historical Significance]. Conference Theses. A.D. Bekarevich, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1983, 51 pages.

"Muzhestvo i bratstvo" [Courage and Fraternity]. Under the editorship of I.N. Shkadov and others. Moscow, Voenizdat, 1982, 239 pages.

"Playa Giron: istoricheskoye znachenie i uroki." [Playa Giron: the Historical Significance and Lessons]. A.D. Bekarevich, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1982, 107 pages.

"Sovetsko-kubinskiye otnosheniya--sotsialistichskiy internatsionalizm v deystvii" [Soviet-Cuban Relations--Socialist Internationalism in Action]. Conference Theses. A.D. Bekarevich, Editor-in-Chief. ILA, 1985, 274 pages.



"Meksika: tendentsii ekonomicheskogo i sotsialno-politicheskogo razvitiya" [Mexico: Economic and Socio-Political Development Trends]. V.V. Volskiy editor-in-chief. "Nauka", 1983, 389 pages.

"Sovetsko-meksikanskiye otnosheniya (1917-1980)" [Soviet-Mexican Relations (1917-1980)]. "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1981, 112 pages.

"Peru: sotsialno-ekonomicheskoye i politicheskoye razvitiye (1968-1980)" [Peru: Socio-economic and Political Development]. Yu.A. Zubritskiy, editor-in-chief. "Nauka", 1982, 295 pages.

"Jose Carlos Mariategui i sovremennost" [Jose Carlos Mariategui and the Present]. Yu.A. Zubritskiy, editor-in-chief. ILA, 1985, 72 pages.

G.S. Yefimova, Ye.V. Tyagunenko. "Chili v ekonomicheskoy strategii SShA" [Chile in U.S. Economic Strategy]. "Nauka", 1983, 199 pages.

"Kultura Ekvadora" [The Culture of Ecuador]. V.A. Kuzmishchev, editor-in-chief. "Nauka", 1985, 279 pages.

-----  
For ILA works for 1961-1980 see LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 4, 1981, pp 133-144

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1986

8543

CSO: 1807/267

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### BOOK ON CARIBBEAN POLITICS, ECONOMY REVIEWED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 4, Apr 86 pp 143-144

[Review by A.D. Dridzo of book "Strany Karibskogo basseyna. Tendentsii ekonomicheskogo i sotsialno-politicheskogo razvitiya" [The Caribbean Countries. Economic and Socio-political Development Tendencies], Editor-in-Chief V.V. Volskiy, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow, "Nauka", 1985, 349 pages]

[Text] Even quite recently West Indian subject matter in domestic journals on Latin American affairs remained, if one can express it this way, on the periphery of specialists' scholarly interests. In recent years the situation has obviously changed for the better: now there exists a small but significant library of works by Soviet researchers on the Caribbean countries. Nonetheless, until the monograph under review came out one could not help but feel the lack of a general work describing the basic characteristics of this region in its past and present. The publication of the book not only fills in an obvious gap in one of the areas of Latin American studies which has become especially timely, but it also signifies the beginning of a new stage of research into the region.

A positive feature of the monograph is the sharpness of the polemical thrust against bourgeois ideas about the history of the Antilles, ideas which are called upon in one form or another to distort and to draw a veil over the main point: the truly terrible role which colonialism played in the fate of this region and that neocolonialism continues to play here. The American, British, French and in a number of cases even local authors attempt to put forward the idea that the division, the mosaic nature and the "insularity" of the West Indies deprive its peoples of the right to their own history and, moreover, the right to genuine political, economic and ideological independence. The specific features of the region, according to their assertions, are also determined by the fact that within its boundaries those laws of historical development which are characteristic of other more "advanced" countries, especially developed capitalist countries, do not apply here or apply to an insignificant degree. It is indicative that these kinds of concepts, which are tinged with a fair amount of racism, are now used (as a sort of "inverse symbol") by the authors of a number of ultra-leftist theories. The work under review convincingly shows the anti-scientific nature of the attempts to

get off the hook the main architects of that very complex situation in which the peoples and states of the Caribbean Sea find themselves--colonialism and imperialism.

The principle used to organize the material deserves praise: the first two sections--on history and economics--serve as a kind of introduction to the following section, which consists of chapters about individual countries and territories. A significant economic and political diversity is characteristic of the West Indies and the territories adjacent to it. This makes a reliable guide necessary; without one it is not only extremely difficult but also practically impossible to evaluate the situation, much less to discover developmental trends. The classification which is worked out in the third section and substantiated in those chapters which comprise it represents an important achievement of the monograph under review. The fourth section is devoted to the foreign policy aspect of the Caribbean problems.

This new collective monograph by ILA staff members is undoubtedly successful. Since the appearance of the book many difficulties facing West Indies specialists have become easier to overcome. Work on Caribbean subject matter is now not only easier but also more interesting.

Taking into account the timeliness of the subject studied by the authors, as well as the comparatively small number of copies printed, one would like to express a desire to see it reprinted in the not too distant future. In a new edition one would like to see, firstly, a map of the region, which is lacking in this monograph, and secondly, geographical, name and subject indices. Thirdly, the work should be supplemented by a bibliography listing those works which, on the one hand, would be a good reference point for specialists and, on the other, would provide a graphic representation of what has been done in our country on the subject of the West Indies. Work of this kind could be supplemented on the basis of the "Latin America in the Soviet Press" indices which the ILA has been putting out for three decades.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1986

8543

CSO: 1807/267

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

Oct 8, 1986